1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

sound of one another. And although the grazing areas high above the village are spatially more extensive than in winter, they are, however, overstocked. Shepherds have a common grazing boundary with the sheep of two or three other stanis on whose grass they systematically trespass. Between families unconnected by kinship or marriage, relations, acted out during these months in terms of reciprocal hostility and theft, are more intense than in winter. Summer, indeed, is the time for quarrels. It is also the season of festivals. It is true that, if the total community is less dispersed than in winter, this is a relative difference since it is still disposed over an area of some 390 square miles. But summer shepherding conditions allow shepherds the possibility of visiting kinsmen who live at a distance. At weddings and village festivals kinsmen are able to meet and exchange their news, and unrelated men have the opportunity to observe one another critically. In summer, generally, social exchanges whether friendly or hostile are both more frequent and more ardent.

Practical arrangements for the care of the flock have a further consequence. Personal and family honour and pride, which are fundamental values of the community, breed a spirit of intense and aggressive competitiveness that sometimes threatens even the relations of unmarried brothers, more commonly the co-operation between more distant kin in the same stani, and frequently provokes verbal or physical quarrels between shepherds unrelated by kinship or marriage. Yet the simple circumstance that within the one stani each shepherd is physically isolated, or with only a single companion, in the service of the different flocks which have been described, limits the potential moments of disharmony in the family and the stani. The animals allow their protectors no rest except when they sleep themselves; otherwise they must continually graze to remain alive and the shepherds must continually follow them because of the absence of fencing and the presence of wolves and sometimes of human thieves. Each shepherd is insulated, as it were, by his work. In the winter, moreover, the shepherds may be more or less isolated from contact with other unrelated shepherds since there is often no grazing boundary with another stani. In the summer, it is true, there may be common grazing boundaries with two or three different stanis across which shepherds face

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

one another on terms of hostility and reciprocal trespass. Yet even then, if we consider the community as a whole, the directions in which the shepherds of one stani may show active aggression are limited, as also are the form and degree of its expression, simply because a shepherd cannot leave his sheep. And this also makes it possible for unrelated shepherds to feel, but not very often to express, an intensity of hostility for one another that would otherwise reduce a vulnerable community of shepherds to a condition of anarchy if confrontations were more numerous than, in fact, they are.

2. THE SHEPHERDS

For the Sarakatsani, sheep and goats, men and women, are important and related oppositions with a moral reference. Sheep are peculiarly God's animals, and their shepherds, made in His image, are essentially noble beings. Women through the particular sensuality of their natures are inherently more likely to have relations with the Devil; and goats were originally the animals of the Devil which Christ captured and tamed for the service of man. It is consistent with these ideas that sheep and shepherds in their respective animal and human worlds display ideal moral characteristics. Sheep are docile, enduring, pure, and intelligent. When the shepherd carries out a small veterinary operation or when the ewe gives birth, the animal suffers in silence. To match this purity and passive courage shepherds ought to be fearless and devoted guardians, and clean in the ritual sense. After sexual intercourse a shepherd must carefully wash his hands before milking sheep and it is generally preferable that the two shepherds of the flock of milking ewes should be unmarried men.

Whether or not shepherds require quite the degree of courage that the values of the community insist they do, is open to doubt. Perhaps devotion, endurance, and a head for heights, would be a more objective assessment. Two experienced shepherds, preferably men between twenty-five and thirty years of age, guard the pregnant or milking ewes. Another young and active shepherd follows the flock of last season's lambs, the 'zigouria'. One or two older but not necessarily intelligent men watch the rams and sterile ewes, the 'sterpha'. Young shepherds before their military service often serve their apprenticeship with the

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

233 shearing is delayed until the warmer weather. Shearing, too,
238 marks the passing of the winter and is considered a festival.
461 On the final day there is meat, wine, and dancing. Like the journey from the plains it is also hard work for the shepherd, giving him, however, an opportunity to prove his expertise and strength. In a highly competitive atmosphere before the appraising eyes of each other and the women, the men of the stani gather in the sheep-fold to clip the fleeces of the different flocks. A strong and skilful man may shear sixty animals in a day.

233 The cycle of shepherding activities continues with the mating
461 season in June or July, the date depending on the condition of
[234] the animals. Then, in the last days of July, the cheese merchant closes his station and gradually with the reduced flow of milk from the pregnant ewes the shepherds milk their animals less frequently until, some time in the first half of August, lactation ceases. At length the shepherds pause and rest.

When the shepherds arrive in the mountains their mood changes almost abruptly from an expectation of the worst to guarded optimism. Since the autumn they have suffered anxiety, crisis, and frequently physical exhaustion in their efforts to avoid disaster to the lambs, a small milk yield, or disease. These dangers do not exist, or are less considerable, in
[578] the summer. At this season the systematic practice of reciprocal grass theft, the sometimes accidental trespass, the intermingling of two flocks when they converge on the cheese-maker's station at milking time, are all situations which may precipitate quarrels with unrelated shepherds that threaten life and honour, but they are not possibilities that cause the shepherd much apprehensive concern. In personal oppositions he is confident in his own strength and courage, he depends on nothing outside himself. On the other hand, whatever skill a shepherd may possess, the dangers which threaten the flock in winter often depend on factors or elements beyond his individual control.
[235] Yet extreme poverty, which is a possible consequence of such a disaster, destroys honour and sometimes takes the lives of small children.

233 The Sarakatsan shepherd identifies himself with his animals.
825 Their condition is almost as personal a concern as his own health and appearance. If a sheep is stoned by another man,
[572] the shepherd's honour is touched.

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

59 612 The family is, indeed, the centre of the shepherd's world. Inside its limits he finds support, affection, and a sense of moral obligation. With certain qualifications these attitudes are extended to all the relations of the kindred. But outside the family and the kindred a man meets and expects only hostility and suspicion. There are conventions of conduct, but there is no general conscience of obligation to others. From the point of view of each individual, the community is divided into those who are kinsmen, a man's own people (δικοί), and those who are not kinsmen, that is strangers (ξένοι). There is a third intermediate category of persons, the affines (συμπέθεροι), strangers with whom a man or his kinsman has become related through a contract of marriage. Confidence, trust, and an altruistic concern about another individual's welfare can only exist between kinsmen, and it is only in a kinship relationship that a man is able to abandon the outlook of self-interest which normally guides him in relations outside the family.

571 602 619 [612]

612 It follows that a man looks towards his kinsmen for practical support. As we have seen, unrelated families are mutually opposed. The family, with reference to which the individual must act in almost all contexts of behaviour, faces a hostile community. Therefore this support is peculiarly important. Yet, in relation to the community's population of about 4,000 souls, the average size of an individual's kindred is small, seldom exceeding 250 men, women, and children of whom some 160 will be second cousins, a category of relations who are on the margin of kinship. Kinsmen are relatively few and correspondingly precious. In summer the kindred is scattered over 390 square miles of difficult and tortuous country, and a man does not, generally, live within an hour's walk of more than one-fifth of his kinsmen. This, in part, is the practical importance of kinship connexions; they offer a certain freedom of social manœuvre. Kinsmen established at strategic points through a community, which is numerically not small and geographically very dispersed, are able to offer hospitality and local information which pride and distrust prevent a man asking of unrelated persons. The network of a man's kinship relations provides him with a system of information and intelligence without which he cannot conduct his affairs efficiently or profitably. The price that he should ask for his milk, his wool, and animals for

● [578] [162] [203]

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

slaughter, the intrigues of others with merchants and officials, which often vitally affect his own affairs, the ever pressing problem of where winter pasture is to be found, this is the kind of information a man exchanges with his kinsman or, more rarely, with a close and trusted affine.

Kinsmen are indispensable in the delicate negotiations of 'match-making'. Before a girl is sought in marriage, very careful inquiries have to be made concerning her virtue, industry, health, and temperament. A kinsman who lives near the girl's family will be in a position to give accurate details; his information will be trusted, and he will treat the affair with the discretion it demands. For marriage involves a contract between two hostile groups, and offence, given or received by either side, is a question of honour and may lead to violence and killing.

I have introduced the notion that the opposed families of this fragmented community are related through competition for prestige. Certainly, it is impossible to miss the competitive flavour of social life outside the home. Men care passionately about their prestige, the prestige of their families, and of their kinsmen. Indeed all these reputations are parts of a single complex. And in a paradoxical fashion they depend upon the opinions of enemies. Whenever there is some incident or affray, the news of it travels with remarkable rapidity to all quarters of the Zagori. Within a matter of forty-eight hours small groups of Sarakatsani throughout the area will be passing judgement on the behaviour of the people involved, as this is evaluated according to the values of the community. They will analyse minutely what a man is reported to have said and done, and they will decide whether he was justified in what he did and whether he displayed manliness (ἀνδρισμός) in defending his honour. In such discussions a man's kinsmen will take his side, acting as advocates and apologists for his behaviour. Furthermore, the mere numerical size of a man's kindred is a matter of prestige, because, other things being equal, it means that he is a man who will be taken notice of, assisted, and well-informed wherever he goes. In discussing kinship the Sarakatsani often say, 'Nobody takes account of a man without kinsmen'. They use, in this context, a word, λογαριάζω, which expresses both the idea of esteeming another man and of

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

happens at weddings that quarrels develop between unrelated guests. Insults, curses, and blows are exchanged, and sometimes knives are drawn. These events have a certain pattern. A man is insulted, or imagines that he has been insulted, by another. At once all the relatives of either man range themselves alongside their kinsman; and those who are unrelated to either party, as well as others embarrassed by an equal allegiance to both sides, throw themselves between the two antagonists. But the paternal or maternal origin of relationship neither increases nor diminishes the obligation to support a kinsman in this or any other situation.

Property and prestige are passed from one generation to the next according to customary rules of inheritance in the one case, and canons of popular judgement in the other, which reflect the symmetry of an individual's relations to the families of origin of his father and mother. Property is itself an element in prestige, while wealth without prestige loses its significance. Individual and family reputation, as I have already indicated, is a self-evident value; without it social life has no meaning. This prestige is inherited both from the father's family and the mother's. It is true that the prestige of paternal connexions is greater; but the quality of the mother's family of origin is also critical, for criticism of the mother, who contributes important moral qualities to the characters of her children, is a peculiarly effective method of denigrating a family. The individual, of course, may increase or diminish his reputation by his own acts but it is on the basis of a reputation inherited from both parents that he at first faces the judgements of the community. And if this inherited reputation is unsatisfactory, it will be exceedingly difficult for the individual by his own efforts to redeem it. It is partly for these reasons that the choice of a wife is a matter which is approached with delicacy and deliberation. Many personal qualities of a prospective bride are taken into consideration but invariably the crucial question to be debated is the quality and prestige of the girl's family and close kin. The Sarakatsani use a Turkish word, ντομάρι, of which the primary meaning is a vein, to indicate the general quality of a man's immediate maternal and paternal ancestors.[1] And if either the

[1] The more general meaning of ντομάρι in modern Greek is 'stone quarry'.

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

vengeance killing even if it concerns the death of a brother or the dishonour of a sister. Under the conditions of social life in a patrilocal extended family it is inevitable that there will be some conflict between a man's roles as son and brother in his family of origin and his roles as husband and father in his family of marriage. In important matters the Sarakatsani solve this problem by holding to the principle that obligations to direct lineal descendants always take priority over obligations to either direct ascendant or collateral kin. It is, then, not marriage but the birth of children which breaches the unity of the group of brothers.

The Sarakatsani claim that brothers would undoubtedly live together all their lives were it not for the quarrels of their wives. This is a rather too simple explanation of the causes which eventually lead to the separation of brothers; yet it is true that the differences between wives often provide the occasions for separation. There are two proverbs which the Sarakatsani often quote when discussing this subject. 'Women make the house and they destroy it' (οἱ γυναῖκες φκιάνουν τὸ σπίτι καὶ τὸ χαλᾶν). 'Wives are like nuts from forty different walnut trees' (ἀπὸ σαράντα καρυδιὲς καρύδια). The second proverb implies that wives are all alike, yet each comes from a different home. 'Each wife', said one informant, 'has her own mother. They cannot come to an understanding.' The Sarakatsani expect the wives of brothers to quarrel and on the whole they are not disappointed in their expectations. Yet, fundamentally, the growing distance between brothers is due to the obligations and affections which they owe to their children and which replace their former attachment to the sibling group. Quarrels between wives are not simply the result of incompatibility of temperament or some innate Greek sense of individuality. They arise because wives identify themselves with the rights and interests of their children. That this exclusive identification occurs, follows from the logic of the kinship system based on equivalent bilateral extension. As we have seen, the elementary family is the only corporate kinship group which is relatively enduring in this bilateral system. The children of each brother have in common with their cousins only half of their kindred. Through their affiliation to the kinsmen of their mother, they have certain affective interests and moral obligations they cannot share with their cousins.

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

The attitudes of wives towards one another are far less
reasonable. Unless their requirements happen to be similar, 596
what is given to one wife is by definition not given to the other. 578
Inevitably each believes that the other is the better treated. An elder brother often makes a conscious effort to treat his younger brother's wife with particular consideration and tact, supplying from the family purse without debate the money required for all her children's needs; shoes, a new jacket, medicine and so on. This may merely infuriate the elder brother's wife who sees herself and her children sacrificed to her husband's wish to maintain intact the relationship with his brother. On the other hand, the younger brother's wife is seldom grateful. She may not believe that she is being favourably treated and, at best, she will still resent the fact that she must apply to her husband's brother for the requirements of her children.

Yet the break-up of the united group of brothers is not due 596
to the quarrels of the wives alone. As his children pass out of 454
infancy, a father's thoughts are increasingly concerned with the problem of how to provide for their future. For instance, it may be necessary to practise extreme economy for a number of years, or even to borrow money to buy additional sheep, in an attempt to build up a flock large enough to support his sons and provide for his daughters' dowries. Obviously such operations can only be carried through efficiently and equitably when each brother has command of his own share of the family's stock.

The affairs of the family group led by Theodoros Ferendinos 596
(see Chart, page 74) illustrate these problems. After thirteen years together in an extended family the five brothers are considering the need to divide their household and the flocks. It is a family of moderate wealth and prestige owning 365 sheep and goats. The five brothers are known to be resolute, brave, and mutually devoted. Yet although I never observed an open [578]
quarrel between these brothers, friction is evident. Four of the brothers are married, two of them have children nearing school age while three of the eldest brother's children are already at school. They are all concerned as to how they will support these growing families. Theodoros the elder brother has four children, but the second and third brothers have only two each. While the group lives in one household it is clear that to some extent the younger brothers are carrying part of the burden of

[Text continues on p. 75]

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

some 'self-regard' (εγωισμός) but the family had to pay fifty shillings for this watch. Admittedly every man must have

During the summer of 1954 Vasili worked for a Thessaly merchant who had come to the Epirus looking for wool. Vasili travelled around the Zagori countryside as his agent, buying up wool wherever he found it. By entering a price in his account book somewhat in excess of the amount he actually paid out, but still below the maximum buying price laid down in the merchant's instructions to him, he was able to make a very pleasing profit in addition to his weekly wage. When he returned to the family he gave almost all the profit to Theodoros but secretly withheld six pounds for himself. Vasili had been married only two years at the time, but his wife was expecting a child in the next month. His conscience was clearly troubled at the deception he was practising and in his confession to me he explained that three years ago there would have been no point in keeping any of the money to himself, but now he was married, his wife was about to have a child, and he vaguely felt the need to have some reserve of money which was entirely under his own control.

The wives of the four married brothers live together in one domestic unit and work under the direction of their mother-in-law. There are many practical advantages in this situation of which they are not unaware. When one wife is cooking the communal meal, another is collecting firewood or carrying water while the old mother-in-law watches over the children. There are goats to be milked, wild herbs to be collected, clothes to be washed. There is the whole lengthy process of spinning and weaving. In all these multifarious domestic tasks the collaboration of the five women makes for companionship and a certain economy of time and energy. But while the joint operations of the brothers with the sheep are based on a relationship of common identification, the co-operation of their wives is of a contractual character. The partnership works smoothly so long as each wife is thought to be pulling her weight in relation to her seniority. This clearly may often be a matter rather of opinion than obvious fact. And while the brothers are usually careful not to express any displeasure they may feel for one another, wives are only too ready to criticize one another in public.

Theodorina, the wife of Theodoros, is criticized because of

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

Theodorina, the wife of Theodoros, is criticized because of 598
her lack of physical robustness. About three years ago she lost 571
a baby girl. She was prostrate with grief and never fully re- 159
covered. She has been to a number of different doctors who [765]
have agreed that she is suffering from 'weakness' but have
variously diagnosed this as due to infected tonsils, bad heart,
and anaemia. She has had her tonsils and adenoids removed [757]
and a number of courses of injections; this treatment has cost a
considerable sum of money and has produced no visible im-
provement. Demetrina, the wife of the second brother, is par-
ticularly scornful of Theodorina. 'Theodorina is down on the
ground (κατὰ γῆς) again', she complains, and goes on to explain
that she is leaving her children in the ditch to fend for them-
selves just because of an idea in her head. This refers to her
grief for her little girl. It is right to grieve, but not to this extent
where she is unable to care properly for her sons and daughters
for whose existence she ought to thank God. No doubt what
really annoys Demetrina and the other women is the money
wasted on medicines, and the extra work which they have to do
when Theodorina periodically says she is too sick to go about
her tasks.

Demetrina, herself, is disliked by all the other wives and her
mother-in-law because of her sharp tongue and her dogmatic
holier-than-thou attitude. Her own family of origin is on the [602]
worst of terms with her husband's brothers and she is suspected,
not without reason, of passing on information about the conduct
of affairs in the extended family into which she has married.
She is a storm centre in many quarrels with the other wives on
account of her four-year-old son, an unpleasant and physically
tough blonde-headed bully, who maltreats his young cousins by
hurling stones and hitting them over the head with pieces of
wood. They note that this child resembles his maternal kin.

The third wife, Eleutherina, is a good worker but graceless 596
in body and personality. She suffers from some catarrhal com- 578
plaint which makes her speech almost unintelligible and causes 159
her nostrils to drool with mucus. Behind her back the other 732
wives mock her for these defects and she is conscious of this.
Her small son Alec, who is four years old, suffers from the same
catarrhal complaint, appears to be mentally backward, and is
subject to periodic fits. She is held responsible for the disabilities [558]
of the child which affect the prestige of the whole family.

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

596 578 159 165 "Vasilina the youngest wife has been married for about two years. She gave birth to a son, but the child was weak and died. Since she has scarcely advanced from the status of being a new bride, she does not assert herself. She is a willing worker but slow and without much intelligence. For these reasons the other women have little patience with her and criticize her freely.

596 578 The wives openly admit that they live in anticipation of the day when their husbands will separate the single household and each wife will become 'mistress' (νοικοκυρά) in her own home. Their imputation of various short-comings to the other wives is merely a way of demonstrating their fundamentally opposed interests in respect to their different families. Each wife/mother is in herself a symbol of the kinship distance which separates her children from their paternal cousins, and therefore her husband from his siblings. The worst quarrels between wives are about their children. And such quarrels are particularly dangerous to the unity of the brothers. Two married brothers frequently stand together and verbally or even physically chastise their wives who make trouble in the family by quarrels over personal differences; but when the issue between the wives concerns their children (however trivial its origin may be), the two sibling/fathers, out of loyalty to and identification with their children, are inevitably committed to the support of their wives.

Therefore a circumstantial factor of some importance in deciding the moment when brothers must separate is the increasing difficulty of maintaining discipline in a joint household without causing offence to the constituent elementary families. When Theodoros on occasions shook a worried head and said, 'We are eighteen individuals (νομάτοι) in this house', this was the cause of his anxiety. As head of the house he could directly discipline only his own wife and children. He would not verbally reprimand a brother's wife in her husband's presence, unless she was a newly married bride or without children; in his absence he would certainly scold her if she did not comply with some instruction which concerned the general running of the joint household; but he could not interfere in her relations with her children. No brother would ever strike another brother's wife.

606 Even the control of the mother-in-law over her sons' wives, though it is still considerable, becomes less complete after three or four years of marriage. In this household there are eight young

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

children and babies playing, fighting, and screaming. Except in the early evening when a sleep of exhaustion stills their activities, the scene is one of constant tumult. In this situation a brother cannot strike the children of another. *A fortiori* one wife cannot in any way interfere with the children of another wife. When a father separates two embattled cousins he pushes the child which is not his own out of the way telling it to go to its mother, and then turns to deal his own child a slap across the face. Clearly these symptoms of disorder and indiscipline in the extended family result from the growing isolation of each of the constituent elementary families. The autonomy of each elementary family in regard to all its internal relationships and the control of its children is not compatible with the co-existence of the families in a single domestic unit.

When an extended family of several brothers and their wives has lived as a single household for a number of years it is not unusual to hear in the gossip of other families some criticism of this arrangement. In fact, few extended families survive for longer than ten years without the separation of at least some brothers. No doubt the criticism of the extended family which does remain united beyond this limit may be attributed, in some measure, to the jealousy of other groups in which brothers have not been able to show quite the same mutual devotion. Yet, if they have succeeded in living up to one kinship value, their detractors are right to point out that they have failed to maintain other and more important values. Thus one critic of the Ferendinos family said that it was not right that the second and third brothers in the family, who each had two children, were not yet complete masters in their own households. They were assisting their elder brother with his larger family to a degree which was scarcely honourable when they had their own children to care for. Moreover, it was added, everybody knew that the wives were at each others' throats. It was dangerous to allow this state of affairs to continue because it would inevitably end in quarrels between the brothers themselves.

3. SEPARATION

There is no precise formalized rule as to when brothers ought to separate. Some informants say that when an elder brother has a family of his own, and his younger brother is also married

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

582 marriage takes place. In a united extended family this presents
596 no difficulty; but if wool had to be collected from a number of
583 autonomous households, it would certainly lead to friction be-
578 tween the wives with reciprocal accusations of sharp practice.
596 Finally, in a large household which has many women the honour
834 of the sister is more efficiently safeguarded. It is not sufficient to have an unmarried brother to take revenge if the sister suffers rape or insult. This is certainly a deterrent, but it does not ensure complete security. It is equally important that whenever a sister goes out on some errand, to gather firewood or carry water, she has a companion to go with her. In the popular mind wells and illicit sexual intercourse are linked together. If a man for any reason wants to see the local girls, he has only to
312 sit by the well and by and by he will see them all. (The wells used by the Sarakatsani traditionally were never, and today are often not, village wells, but remote mountain springs.) If an unmarried girl goes to the well too frequently alone, the gossips are quick to suggest that her object is to collect something more than a barrel of water. But if she always has a companion, she is protected both from the danger of assault which is probably, in fact, remote, and from the danger of slander which is much more real.

596 For these reasons, then, brothers do not divide the extended
594 household until all the sisters are married. Afterwards, the brothers are free to complete their own marriages and separate their households in the manner that has been described. Each is now the leader of an autonomous family. But when the division of the joint household occurs with 'good heart', and where there is sufficient grazing, they will normally remain together in a 'company' under the general leadership of the eldest brother. But working operations are now on a basis of strict accounting. Brothers often point out that the relative peace and goodwill which prevails between their wives and children after the division of the extended family household is bought at the price of a hitherto unknown element of calculation in their own relations. This is true. However, they sometimes forget that just before division took place it was often precisely the lack of calculation in their relations that they themselves had been complaining about.

000 In describing the process of development which occurs

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

474 602 571 Membership in a 'company' is in principle based on free association, although in particular cases a man without brothers may be so dependent upon the particular kinsmen who form the dominant nucleus of a 'company', that he has, in fact, little choice. But co-operating 'companies' are relatively stable associations only as long as the problems they help member families to overcome remain problems. They are a loose form of contractual association in which each family jealously guards its domestic autonomy and the right to secede at any time. Power to influence the association's decisions lies with the dominant group of brothers from whom the company takes its name, and it is the desire to escape from the position of dependence on this group which leads the more distantly related families in the association to detach themselves from it in the summer months.

474 602 578 Co-operation between kinsmen and affines has its difficulties. So imperative are the interests of a man's own family that sometimes he begins to suspect even the actions of a close kinsman if he co-operates with him: and he, himself, must sometimes fight against the temptation to defraud a kinsman or an affine. The Sarakatsani say that 'every stani has a pimp' (κάθε στάνη έχει τὸ ρουφιάνο της). Ρουφιάνος means a procurer and by extension a man without conscience or manliness. In this context it implies that in each co-operating group the cheese merchant is able to find at least one man who for the favour of more liberal credits is prepared to play the part of informer about the secrets of the group. As a statement of fact this is an exaggeration, but it testifies accurately to the strains and restraints that co-operation between related families involves, strains which are thought to be peculiarly inappropriate in the relations of kinsmen.

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

V

COLLATERAL KINSMEN

1. FAVOURS AND OBLIGATIONS

609 829 612 577

THE Sarakatsani assume that ill-faith, doubt, and suspicion characterize the relations of men who are not kinsmen. In contrast, they think that the values and attitudes which make possible the communion of kinsmen are expressed in the meaning of ἐμπιστοσύνη, faith, trust, confidence; or πίστη, faith, belief. It is, then, not surprising that unrelated men very rarely co-operate in the management of their sheep or in any other venture; except, necessarily, the marriages of their children.

612

The rights and obligations of kinship are of a general and diffuse kind, not restricted to specific situations. A man is confident that a kinsman will keep a secret. He opens his mind to him freely because he knows he will use discretion in what he should pass on and what he must not. He believes the information that a kinsman gives to him, and he uses it as a basis for action without the fear of a lie or a trap. He is confident that when his own conduct is being evaluated by the community his kinsmen will support his case; and for his part he will not suffer in silence the public criticism of any of his kin. Above all, he feels secure and confident that when he is in difficulty there will be people who care for his interests and will give him assistance. These sentiments of confidence and trust are prescribed and follow from the simple existence of the kin relationship; they do not depend on the history of a gradually developing intimacy.

571 577

When a Sarakatsanos receives a favour from another, he must show gratitude. 'One good turn deserves another' (ἡ χάρη θέλει ἀντίχαρη). Even if only between the acceptance of some service and its later repayment, gratitude must for a while act as a makeweight in the balance. Not to show gratitude for help, which has been freely given, is behaviour open to severe public reproach. But to be grateful is to be 'obliged' (ὑποχρεωμένος); and this is an admission of inequality and even of weakness. The rare attempts at co-operation between unrelated persons have invariably ended in accusations and counter accusations that one man has done more for the other who, in return, has

626

609 578

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

609 578 [558] not shown the right attitude of a man under obligation. This, in a sense, is true. For neither side can admit to obligation without losing prestige; and both must attempt to claim the superordinate position in a creditor-debtor relationship.

612 But a man does not feel any embarrassment in asking for help from a kinsman. In these circumstances there is no shame in being under obligation or a debt of gratitude. Irrespective of the state of the balance of favours and counter favours, collateral relatives of the same generation, by reason of their kinship, are conceptually equal since they are descended from a pair of siblings who, before marriage and apart from the chances of [554] age and sex, were socially equivalent persons. A man does not lose prestige through obligation to a kinsman; on the contrary his reputation is increased, for the community pays attention to a person whose kinsmen lend him immediate and effective support. And for the man who gives aid to his kin, the knowledge that men learn of his actions through the gratitude of the kinsman who receives it, is sufficient recompense. For in this way he wins a reputation as a man of honour 'who supports his kinsmen'. If through wealth or influence a man is in a position to act as a general protector of his kindred, not only is he expected to do so, but this, in most cases, is also his wish. There is some altruism here. A man takes pleasure in the company of his kinsman; he finds him on occasion a source of practical advantage, but in particular he holds to him and has confidence in him simply because he is a kinsman. And for these reasons complaints of ingratitude against kinsmen are relatively few.

612 627 But although a man is under a moral obligation to help a collateral relative, this assistance is not given unconditionally. The important consideration is that it must not conflict with the interests of the family. This emerges very clearly in situations of physical violence. A man is not expected to accept responsibility for avenging the death of a collateral kinsman. He will give moral support to the family of the victim but he is unlikely to go [682] farther than that. A vengeance killing leads to the arrest of the killer and a prison sentence, which is sometimes followed by self-imposed exile in another district of Greece when there is any fear of counter vengeance. In this way a shepherd's family might lose its protector at least for some years, perhaps for ever. Only in unusual circumstances where a man feels that his

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

youth provide enough incidents to nourish any personal aversion which for one reason or another may have arisen between young cousins. And if brothers quarrel, this, of course, inevitably affects the relations of their children. But a marked coolness between cousins of this class is rare; the Neochori group of 317 Sarakatsani provides only one example.

Relations between men and women who are reciprocally mother's brother's children and father's sister's children are almost always close and affectionate. These cousins are the children of a sister and brother whose relationship before the sister's marriage was governed by categorical obligations which concerned the honour of the girl, her brother, and the whole family. For the sister who arrives at her wedding day with a reputation in the community for right conduct, a brother has feelings of deep gratitude and trust which he expresses in his constant anxious inquiries about her welfare from anyone he meets who lives near her husband's huts. He is always ready to help his brother-in-law, however little he may like him personally, in order to make life a little easier for his sister and her children. And since women spend much time discussing kinsmen and their affairs, the sister's children learn at an early age about their cousins who are the children of her brother. But the relations of these cousins are not only a question of sentiment and its extension. Marriage is a contract between two unrelated families; and despite mutual distrust both groups are interested to consolidate their alliance. In the early years the two families of origin of the married pair may find in it a useful addition to the range of their co-operative relationships. However, the true concern of the husband and his wife's brothers is that their children shall not lack the support of a strong and devoted kindred. Their children are reciprocally those cousins who normally live in different localities and do not co-operate in sheep management. Between them there ought to be the kind of trust and sympathy which lead to deep friendship, the exchange of free favours, and that measure of general moral support without which a man's reputation cannot survive for long among the Sarakatsani.

From time to time there are opportunities to strengthen the affective quality of these relations. For a number of years after her marriage a woman pays one or possibly two visits a year to

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

Zagori, he decided to pay a visit to his 'cousin' John, a Sarakatsanos of wealth and influence. He was confident that John could help him through his influence over the local Member of Parliament. 'He has him in his pocket' (τὸν ἔχει στὴ τσέπη του), he explained. John and Sotiri are third cousins. This otherwise tenuous and formally unrecognized kinship link is 'drawn in' to provide a basis of mutual trust in a relationship which is clearly one of patronage. John, for his part, does not resent the importunate requests of his distant relatives. The ability to bestow patronage is its own reward, for it increases his prestige not only in the community of Sarakatsani but with such personalities as parliamentary candidates who compete for the votes which they believe he commands.

A man's 'effective kindred' may also be considerably more restricted than the conventional limits allow. This happens when a family possesses so little prestige that kinsmen would rather not have any unnecessary association with its members. A case in point is the family of Pistiolis at Skamneli which is desperately poor and although morally upright is almost socially outcast. The genealogical information which the father was able to provide was meagre. He did not even know where most of his first cousins were living, and of second cousins he could name only a few. Over a long period of years he had received very few invitations to the weddings of kinsmen, and although he travelled considerably, earning a pittance by carrying goods on his two pack mules, he was too ashamed to ask for hospitality at a kinsman's home in the places where he knew them to be living; consequently he always slept in the open, a circumstance which encouraged mocking remarks about his shaggy and uncouth appearance.

But besides the flexibility in the range of obligations to collateral kinsmen there are also situations which may lead to their complete abrogation. Trust and mutual confidence is the basis of kin relationship. Quarrels which question these qualities are rare, but where they do occur they are far more serious than the differences which are expected to arise between unrelated men. In the latter instance normal social relations may be resumed after a long period of estrangement, but in the former case, especially where one kinsman has publicly insulted another, confidence is permanently destroyed. The proverb,

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

612 'Why is the wound in your eye so deep? Because my kinsman
578 gouged it out' (γιατί'ν'τὸ μάτι σου βαθειὰ βγαλμένο; — γιατί μοῦ
539 τό'βγαλε δυκός), expresses precisely this difference.

612 Between kinsmen who co-operate in a 'company' for the co-
474 management of their flocks it is almost inevitable that from time
578 to time differing interests produce a coolness in their relations. Yet it is remarkable how seldom these frictions develop into the kind of quarrel which causes an irreparable breach. A stern self-control is maintained by these kinsmen on their injured feelings because they know that they depend on each other's assistance in the struggle to survive the hazards, natural and political, which surround them. However, any form of dishonesty in their co-operative handling of the flocks destroys the
[685] basis of their association. Recently a cousin who was herding his sheep with a 'company' of married brothers was discovered during the lambing season in the act of trying to attach a number of his kinsmen's newly born ewe lambs to his own ewes, and his own male lambs to the ewes which he had robbed. Inevitably, after such an incident, the trust between these kinsmen was permanently broken.

835 Incest (αἱμομιξία) represents the most dramatic form of decep-
612 tion that one kinsman can practise on another. Unmarried
605 cousins of opposite sex enjoy an easy, friendly companionship with one another which they are denied with unrelated persons. Very occasionally a youth succumbs to the temptation of sexual experiments with a young kinswoman, an act in which he may destroy both the girl's honour and his own. It seems most unlikely that these affairs, if protracted, can ever remain secret in a community where there are so many questioning eyes. Over
835 a period of ten years I discovered three probable instances, of
605 which one was incest between first cousins. In this case a youth
558 was staying in his uncle's house and there, it seems, seduced the unmarried daughter. The cousin had left his uncle's house before it became apparent that the girl was pregnant, and he naturally denied from a distance that he had had any hand in the matter. The girl for her part claimed that she had been impregnated by divine, not human, means, but little attention was paid to this suggestion. The girl's family did not take any drastic action
[684] in the matter beyond disposing of the child when it was born. The girl herself was allowed to live; and in fact, a year or two

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

4. EXPRESSIONS OF SOLIDARITY

619 612 [581] The Zagori community of Sarakatsani is geographically dispersed for reasons which are mainly ecological. Patrilocal marriage, suspicion of affines who live near the same village, yet the need for strategic alliances in other parts of Zagori, are factors which lead men to look for brides in a distant neighbourhood. Consequently the kindred of any individual tends to be more or less congruent with the boundaries of the community itself, in the sense that a shepherd generally has at least 527 a few relatives in any quarter of the Zagori. For these reasons the 612 few festive occasions during the year which bring distant kins- 591 men together are looked forward to with some anticipation. This is so not only for the utilitarian consideration that it is valuable to renew associations with kinsmen whose practical help may be required in the future, but simply for the company of people who value a man and return his affections. It is an aspect of the constant yearning for unity in a society which is, in [183] fact, fragmented by exclusive familial loyalties. It might be said that these occasions when kinsmen meet are important because in the atmosphere of festival excitement the sentiments of kin- 585 ship solidarity are strengthened and recreated. At weddings, for 527 example, quarrels almost always develop between unrelated 612 guests, and the kinsmen who rush to the aid of their own people [579] are giving a dramatized expression to the ideal of kinship solidarity. But, if it is true that the gathering of dispersed kinsfolk is an occasion for the restatement of kinship values, it is also true that it is the sentiment of kinship which invokes the gathering at all. Thus, although wedding invitations are sent out to all consanguineal and to a large number of affinal relatives, not all of the more distantly related of these persons will attend, and it is always recognized that whether or not an invited kinsman comes to the wedding is an indication of the effective solidarity, or absence of solidarity, between the invited man's family and the family of the groom or bride. Naturally the whole of the kinsman's family cannot attend a wedding together. The demands of shepherding prevent this. But one member at least is expected to go as a representative.

612 574 A man, of course, may visit a kinsman at any time; in his huts he will always find shelter and hospitality for the night.

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

612 management, are the cousins least likely to form those impor-
605 tant links of devoted friendship. Since marriage is patrilocal it is the fathers of these cousins who experienced the various constraints of life in an extended family. These considerations do not generally apply to the other categories of first cousin who
[572] normally live in other neighbourhoods. It is among these relatives that a man finds his intimate friends. For these cousins are able to emphasize in their behaviour the altruistic qualities of collateral kinship, particularly in the performance of free favours. Various considerations, then, tend to identify the interests of collateral kinsmen, others to set them apart. We may
612 look at this from another point of view. The fact that for any
571 individual the community is divided into the opposed categories of kinsmen, 'own people', and non-kinsmen, 'strangers', is clearly a factor which unites people who can trust one another against the rest of the world who are not to be trusted. Generally, a man can only co-operate with a kinsman, find a true friend among his cousins, talk to an unmarried girl who is a kinswoman, and so on. However, the members of a man's kindred are not undifferentiated. Some are close kinsmen, others more distant. There is not quite the same measure of responsibility and obligation to a second cousin as there is to a first. Moreover, as children grow up their parents are more concerned with their own descendants and less with collateral kinsmen. But, quite apart from any considerations which relate specifically to the internal structure of the kindred, questions of prestige are
[558] always a potential threat to the solidarity of kinsmen. Kinsmen are identified in the thoughts of outsiders and if one man loses prestige, whether it is due to moral error, poverty, or physical deformity, his kinsman suffers with him. In these circumstances his only defence is to withdraw temporarily or permanently from the relationship.

Sarakatsani are fully aware of the fragmented character of
[578] their community. They realize that one man's hand is turned against another's. They continually lament the distrust which exists between unrelated men and the element of calculation which must exist even in the relations of kinsmen who co-
[554] operate at work. They value their relations with kinsmen who live in other neighbourhoods not only for the various practical reasons we have elaborated, but because of the generally

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

584 within eight days. If the negotiator has worked skilfully, there is little chance of the girl's family rejecting the proposal. Within a few days a kinsman of the girl's family arrives at the future bridegroom's homestead, inviting the family to come to the home of the girl's family on the next Sunday to effect the betrothal contract (τὸ σύβιασμα).

178 It is only in the last ten years that the betrothal ceremony, under the influence of village customs, has developed into a feast where both the families participate. Previously, the father or eldest brother came alone to the girl's house. He was offered Turkish delight and ouzo (κέρασμα), and immediately afterwards the two heads of family exchanged the rings, an act which indicated the formal sealing of the contract. The girl's representative handed over her wedding ring, tied in a white handkerchief, which contained also, rice, red and white wool, and a gold sovereign. In return, he took from the bridegroom's brother, or father, the ring which was to be worn by the groom at the wedding ceremony. Each side kept the other's ring until the day of the marriage as a pledge that the marriage contract would be honoured.

584 178 At the modern betrothal feast the exchange of rings is effected in the same manner. But in place of the single representative the whole of the bridegroom's family together with various close kinsmen make the journey on the appointed Sunday to the home of the bride's family where they are entertained with feasting and dancing until the early hours of the Monday morning. There is something inappropriate about this act of commensality between future affines. At the moment of betrothal there are only feelings of suspicion and distrust between the two sides. This is reflected in the unhappy record of betrothal feasts since this village custom was adopted. Brawling between hosts and guests is not infrequent and generally the result of these celebrations is that relations between the two groups deteriorate yet further.

584 178 579

584 Under the old convention, when the groom's representative arrived to exchange the rings, it was customary to hide away the future bride in the hut of a close kinsman. The ostensible purpose of this manœuvre was to protect the reputation and sensibilities of the maiden from the shame of suffering the gaze of her future father- or brother-in-law. But, also, it was thought

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

to be imprudent to display the girl in case she did not please the groom's representative. Girls marry strictly in accordance with the order of birth and if the eldest unmarried daughter is ugly or unhealthy a family will sometimes try to deceive an inexperienced negotiator into believing that a younger and more personable sister is the next in order to marry. In any event, whether the bride was particularly ill favoured or not, it was considered wise that the groom's people should remain in ignorance of the bride's appearance until the wedding day. And this was the more easily achieved twenty years ago when the Sarakatsani did not live in, or generally close to, the mountain villages. In the modern betrothal feast, the future bride appears only about an hour before the groom's party are due to depart, that is between four and five o'clock in the morning. By this time the rings have been exchanged and there is no way of retreat left open to the bridegroom. The girl appears in the doorway with a tray of Turkish delight and small glasses of ouzo which she offers to each member of the other party in turn, including her future husband. She disappears, to return a quarter of an hour later with cups of coffee which she again offers to the bridegroom and his kinsmen. The groom's kinsmen invariably demand that the girl should appear much earlier in the proceedings before the rings have been exchanged, as indeed she ought to do if the village custom were strictly adhered to. Invariably, the girl's father and brothers refuse the request, and it is often this refusal which is the beginning of the brawling and quarrelling between the two groups. The traditional seclusion of the girl in a relative's hut, the present-day precaution to produce her only when the rings have been exchanged, the practice of trickery and the fear of it, all indicate the quality of the relations which exist between the two sides at the moment they enter into this contract.

The betrothal contract amongst the Sarakatsani is entirely secular and it is an agreement between families rather than individuals. The groom contracts to marry a certain man's daughter whose face he may never have seen rather than a particular person of the opposite sex. If he withdraws from this agreement, not only does he break his pledged word but he damages the girl's reputation in a way which makes it impossible for her to make an honourable marriage in the future. For it

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

already had the opportunity to see the girl more naturally at a wedding, a village festival, or perhaps on the road during the two annual migrations between the mountains and the plain. And young men look forward to these occasions as opportunities to assess the virtues of unrelated maidens. But in whatever way a man succeeds in seeing the girl, his purpose must remain secret.

There is no likelihood of a change of mind on the part of the girl's family between betrothal and marriage. Men and youths lead a public life and their virtues and deficiencies are more widely known than those of their sisters and daughters who live and work in privacy close to, or inside, the huts. The action of the girl's family which is most likely to give grave offence to the man and his kinsmen is not the breaking of the betrothal contract, but unwillingness to enter into it at all. Even if the refusal is made through the negotiator, the situation is serious enough, and the reactions of the groom's family depend to some extent on the diplomacy with which the negative answer is given. The usual formula is that the family are not yet ready to marry the girl. She is too young, and she has not yet completed her dowry, or the supplementary dowry asked for is too high, although this last excuse is not often made since no family wishes to plead poverty. In the event of the refusal being made after the brother or father of the man has made a formal request for the girl's hand, the situation is much graver. In any event, the fact that the man wanted the girl, and was refused, is bound to become generally known. If the refusal is made directly and not through the negotiator, it is more obviously an insult. Such direct refusals are, however, rare. What the rejected bridegroom will do depends upon his estimate of the effect of his unsuccessful suit on his own and his family's prestige in the community. If he believes that he has been made to look ridiculous, he may be driven to attempt the only remedy, abduction.

To abduct a girl against her will is a dangerous undertaking. The man, together with one or two trusted kinsmen, mounted on fast horses, waylay the girl when she is collecting wood or water at some distance from her home. Naturally she resists and on this account she is not always handled with gentleness. One wife, who is now happily devoted to her abductor, told

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

Half an hour later, as they drink the one glass of ouzo which, as we have seen, is the full extent of the hospitality shown to them, the bridegroom's kinsmen sing, 585 602

[539]

'We have not come for food or drink,
But because we love you,
We have come to see you.
I find tables fair and laden,
And glasses brimming over.
Three maidens with black eyes serve us.
Three maidens with the eyebrows of angels.'[3]

They could hardly sing more fairly. Thus during the two or three hours that the parties of the bride and the groom are in contact, marriage custom enjoins the expression of the opposed sentiments of friendship and enmity. It indicates the ambivalent character of the affinal relationship which demands co-operation between previously unrelated and therefore hostile families. Naturally this ambivalence of sentiment is more apparent in the early years, but it never wholly vanishes at any time.

The margins between antagonism permitted and instituted by convention and the display of excessive malice is narrow. Quarrels over the time and precise arrangements of the bride's departure frequently flare up into free violence. In one case, no sooner had the bride progressed some two hundred yards on her journey to the groom's home, than a fierce rain storm broke overhead drenching the bride and her white wedding dress. 585 602 578

[3] Δὲν ἤρθαμαν γιὰ φαΐ γιὰ πιΐ
ροϊδούλα, ροϊδούλα.
Μεῖς σᾶς ἀγαπήσαμεν,
ροϊδούλα, ροϊδούλα,
ροϊδούλα, χαμαϊδούλα,
κι' ἤρθαμεν νὰ σᾶς δοῦμε.
βρίσκω τραπέζια νόμορφα
ροϊδούλα, ροϊδούλα,
ροϊδούλα, χαμαϊδούλα,
γυαλιὰ παραγιομάτα.
Τρεῖς μαυρομάτες μᾶς κερνᾶν,
ροϊδούλα, ροϊδούλα,
ροϊδούλα, χαμαϊδούλα,
κι τρεῖς ἀγγελαφρύδες.

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

585 602 578 577 Her relatives, leaping to their horses, rode after the cavalcade insisting that the bride return and take shelter. The groom's kinsmen angrily refused to halt, pointing out that if a bride retraces her steps or even looks round upon the house she has left, it brings ill luck upon her new home. Refusing to be drawn into further argument, they rode on. The enraged kinsmen of the bride dismounted, and blaspheming against the sisters and mothers of their future affines, sent them away to a fusillade of rifle shots over their heads and stones aimed at their bodies.

However, the separate celebration of the wedding feast, each family in its own home, the denial of commensality, and the mutual display of antagonism institutionalized in wedding custom, are the last occasions on which the two families are permitted to bear witness openly to the aspect of mutual opposition in their relationship. Before the eldest brother of the bridegroom leaves the bride's house, he is offered a glass of ouzo by the bride's father or brother who says, 'We shall wait for you'. This refers to the customary visit or 'return' (ἐπιστροφή), which is made by the bride and groom and the latter's close relatives to the former home of the bride, generally on the second Sunday after the wedding. Meat is killed, quantities of wine are bought, and there is feasting and dancing through the night.

585 602 581 The 'return' is an important occasion. By this time, the new marriage relationship has been established both by the secular contract of betrothal between the two families and by the joining of the two individuals in the religious sacrament of marriage. In the first words of the service which refer to the bride and groom, the priest says, 'Let us pray to the Lord for his servants (X., Y.) who are now joining the one with the other for the common life of marriage.' The two individuals are now a social unity, a man-and-wife (ἀνδρόγυνο). It is not possible to help the one and not help the other, or withdraw support from one without withdrawing support from the other. Thus, the behaviour of both families at the 'return is necessarily oriented towards co-operation and forced goodwill.

585 602 At first conversation between the two families is stilted and formal, and restricted to neutral topics such as weather and taxes. The bride and groom, under the eyes of their respective affines, sit silent and constrained. But as the evening wears on,

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

the wine and the dance produce a mellowing effect on the assembly; the groom begins to smile, and even the bride, with the merest flutter of her lips, tries to follow the singing.

One effect of this reunion of the bride with her people is to establish the interest of the bride's family in the new family which will be formed at the birth of the first child. The knowledge that the unborn children of the married pair will be affiliated equally to both their maternal and paternal relatives forces both sets of affines to act towards each other in a calculatingly friendly manner. However, this attitude is dictated not only by their common interest in the new family, but for reasons of prestige. Other people are uncharitably amused when a family is having in-law trouble (πιάστηκαν οι συμπέθεροι). In general both sets of affines try hard to conciliate one another and it follows that the attitudes of affines act as a strong sanction on a spouse in his or her actions within the marriage relationship. Similarly, in a wider sense, the attitude of one set of affines is a sanction for the correct conduct of the other set.

But what is undoubtedly uppermost in the minds of the bride's kinsmen at the 'return', is an anxiety to find out how the girl has been treated in general and in particular a certain malicious hope that perhaps the bridegroom has encountered some sexual difficulty. Conversely, the object of the groom's people is to deny the bride the opportunity to transmit this kind of information. A sister or brother's wife of the bridegroom is always a member of the groom's party; she sits close to the bride, and attends her every movement so far as good manners will allow. However, the young wife generally succeeds in whispering a few of the desired details into the ear of her mother or a sister; and every Sarakatsan woman is a mistress of the art of conveying meaning with her eyes.

In the morning the affines say farewell. No sooner have the echoes of the piously uttered sentiments of goodwill died away than each side indulges in a critical appraisal of what was said and done by the other side at the 'return'. The bride's family, in particular, may have some very interesting material to discuss whether it is fact or simply conjecture. Invariably the criticism is very unfriendly and reveals the hostility of the affinal relationship, a hostility, however, which must no longer be openly expressed.

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

within this narrow circle affinal relationships which do not mediate links of cousinship in the first descendant generation are vulnerable to stress and friction. In particular a man's relations with the brothers of his brother's wife are easily beset with resentment and jealousies. Inevitably one brother sometimes makes a more successful marriage than another, whether this be judged in terms of dowry, the social standing of the bride's family, or her physical beauty. Furthermore, marriage and the birth of his children end a man's categorical obligations to his own siblings; and at the same time he must give particular consideration to his relations with the close kinsmen of his wife. These are events which must lead to a growing distance between the members of a sibling group. A man feels free to show more enmity to affines related through his brother's wife, persons who stand for the weakening of kinship ties in his family of origin and his kindred, than to affines related through his own wife who represent co-operative endeavour in the support of his own descendants.

An example of difficulties between affines occurred in the extended family of Theodoros Ferendinos, whose affairs were discussed in some detail in chapter four. The second brother, Demetrios, married the sister of George Balatsos. During the village elections, in 1955, an agreement was made between the heads of all the Sarakatsan households to cast their votes in unanimous support of the opposition party which had secretly promised a reduction in pasturage dues. This agreement became known to the other side. The President of the village by an astute combination of bribery and threats persuaded Balatsos and another influential family head secretly to ignore the agreement and vote for his own group. In the event, the President retained office by a margin of five votes. The defection of the Balatsos family from the original agreement did not, however, remain a secret. When Theodoros Ferendinos met George Balatsos in a street in Jannina a week after the election, bitter words passed between the two men! From that day, although the two families lived in the same village, the members of the two groups avoided meeting or talking to one another. Demetrios and his wife, however, were exceptions. Without mentioning the fact Demetrios paid a number of visits to his affines whose huts lay only some 300 yards away. Theodoros

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

Theodoros

602 578 and his other brothers were able effectively to express their hostility towards the Balatsos group for their faithless behaviour. But Demetrios, because they were the family of his wife and the close maternal kin of his two young children, felt that in some way he must maintain these relations. For some months 602 578 593 this fact was a source of considerable annoyance to his brothers, who inside the family circle and in the absences of his wife ridiculed his attitude of compromise. Fortunately he is an easy-tempered man and accepted these rebukes in silence. But an element of strain was introduced into the relations of the brothers which in other families might have led to blows and the permanent severance of relations. A man must try to hold a balance between his attachment to his siblings which derives from the bonds of mutual identification in his family of origin and his relations of contractual co-operation with the kinsmen of his wife. This is not always easy.

602 [594] It is this 'balance', in relation to parents' categorical duties to their children, which leads to the emancipation of the elementary family from both the families of origin of the two [596] parents. In describing life in the extended family we saw how the control of the husband's family over his bride suddenly weakens after the birth of her first child; how the brothers of the husband no longer give the bride peremptory orders in his presence; how they must never interfere with her handling of her children and so on.

593 594 There is a corresponding degree of independence from any influence of the wife's family of origin; but in this instance it is established immediately on the day of marriage. When a bride goes to see her parents, she is not permitted for the four or five days of her visit to do any work. As an honoured guest she sits by the hearth, and to occupy her hands, while she gossips, she spins wool. But it must be her own wool especially transported in a small sack by her husband for this purpose. She is not permitted to spin her mother's wool even in a situation where the family is under pressure to finish the dowry of a younger sister.

593 606 Moreover, when a father or brother has given his daughter or sister in marriage, he is quite powerless to interfere directly if the husband maltreats her. Chronic wife-beating is rare, but where it does occur, the wife's family can only help her by

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

they are also an important incidental factor in support of the community's values; because, if men do not conform to these, they and their close kinsmen will not make honourable marriages. What sets men apart in one set of circumstances, tends to unite them in another.

The characteristic ambivalence of affinal relations has analogous consequences in terms of the spatial distribution of kinsmen. The Sarakatsani do not approve of marriages between families who live in the same village neighbourhood. For instance, the marriage of Demetrios Ferendinos to the sister of George Balatsos is the only case in his summer village. It is significant that this alliance provides us with an example of friction between affines. The Sarakatsani tell one that 'affines quarrel easily' (πιάνονται εύκολα οι συμπέθεροι). It is particularly dangerous if the bride is able to run to her parents and brothers with tales of ill-treatment, and gossip about what goes on inside her husband's family. Not only is it safer to keep affines at a distance, but in another neighbourhood they may sometimes be of practical use. Marriages which are arranged between families in different neighbourhoods tend to produce individual kindreds which are dispersed and whose geographical 'boundaries' are roughly congruent with the boundaries of the community itself. A man through his scattered kindred and affinal relations participates vicariously in the life of the community of the Zagori Sarakatsani. If he has a kinsman or affine in a distant neighbourhood, he is interested in its local affairs, for these affect his relative whose interests are a matter of sympathetic concern to him and in certain circumstances may affect his own prestige. Therefore distrust of affines leads to the practice of taking a bride from another, preferably a distant, neighbourhood; this is one factor in the wide dispersion of individual kindreds in the community; and, in turn, this dispersion of recognized kinship ties increases the individual's consciousness of participation and membership in the total community.

These, then, are instances where marriage regulations or conventional attitudes about affines lead to a certain distance, between kinsmen in the first instance, between affines in the second, but in their further consequences encourage a wider synthesis; in the one case, in terms of conformity to the values

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

almost unthinkable. Only slightly less serious is swearing at or insulting a father. Both are acts of insolent and wanton violence. Of one son, not a Sarakatsanos, who publicly struck his father, the Sarakatsani said, 'He has the devil in him' (ἔχει τὸ διάβολο μέσα του), in a sense which was not intended as metaphorical. It was indeed the only way of explaining the youth's behaviour. To swear at a father at any time, but especially in public, shows the contempt of the son for his father. If he had been a good father with the moral authority of a good father, it is held that such an incident could scarcely have occurred. A son, it is pointed out, takes after his father particularly in his moral constitution, and thus both the outraged parent and the guilty son are dishonoured through the action of the son. To curse or strike a father is, also, a grave sin (ἁμαρτία), for it is an act which upsets a part of the absolute order in life instituted and sanctioned by God. The misfortunes of a person guilty of such acts are always considered to be punishments from God.

The relationship of a father and a son in late adolescence or early manhood is one of delicate balance. The son continues to accept the authority of the father and to show him respect, but this acceptance by the son is now to a degree contingent on his father respecting the growing maturity of his son's social personality. Violence, whether it comes from father or son, destroys the moral basis of the relationship and the mutual esteem which ought to exist between them. During the last five or six years before the eldest son marries, there may be many differences of opinion between an ageing father and his young sons. That these very seldom occasion a show of public as distinct from private disrespect to a father, and almost never develop into quarrels with physical violence, is undoubtedly due to the consciousness of a responsibility felt by both father and son to the total family group, in which through common membership and common loyalties their interests are identified.

In chapter four I have already said something about the transfer of executive power from the father to his eldest son. It will be remembered that the eldest son, impatient to be recognized in the community as a family head, cannot be expected to wait beyond his thirtieth or thirty-first birthday before taking a wife, and that after the birth of his first child, he expects to take over control of the family's affairs. The sanction

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

593 contingency and reciprocity enters into the relationship. A son must give his father respect, be an efficient worker, and above all else show that he is a courageous protagonist of his family. The love and esteem of the father depend on his performance in these matters. By the time a son has returned from his military service, the conditional element in the relationship is increasingly on the side of the son, who avoids showing public disrespect to his father and continues to accept his authority on the understanding that the father, for his [888] part, respects his son's maturing social personality. After the retirement of the father, the sons in the extended family are under an absolute obligation to care for the old man, but the degree of their concern for his comfort may vary according to the past history of their relations. The conditional character of the affection of the father for a daughter is even more pro- [894] nounced. If the girl's reputation for virtue remains unblemished, she receives his favour; if it does not, she may suffer the ulti- 593 mate sanction of death at the hands of her own father. In turn, 584 the attitude of a married daughter to her father is contingent on whether he has given her to a good husband of an honourable ● [578] family. The daughter of a rich and powerful family, forced against her will to marry her second cousin, swore to her father as she left her home that she would never set foot in it again. Such a case of a complete breach of trust and mutual esteem between father and daughter is rare; but there are also women who harbour resentment against their fathers because, as they allege, they were given to indifferent husbands in order to avoid the payment of a substantial dowry.

3. SIBLINGS

593 The idea of 'one blood' which they share in their common [827] filiation to the same parents is the value that underlies the impressive solidarity of siblings in the elementary family and their almost complete identification of interests. In the eyes of outsiders siblings are morally identified. Whatever, for good or ill, is suffered or achieved by one sibling is held to affect the other siblings to an almost equivalent degree. An insult to any member of the group is felt with the same resentment by all the [627] brothers and sisters. If the brothers are adult, the Sarakatsani believe that an unmarried brother is the right and appropriate person to redress the wrongs of rape and homicide

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagri

identification of brothers tolerates some variation in individual skill, strength, and energy, and a man does not complain although it may be clear that he contributes more to the total effort than his brother. For if in this fellowship my brother is as myself, a strict sense of calculation and reciprocity is out of place. Brothers practise a simple communism in respect of the small amounts of pocket-money which they receive from a father or elder brother. If a brother wants a shilling so that he can go to the coffee-shop, another brother will at once give it to him without question, or thought of repayment. Brothers borrow goat-hair capes, shepherds' crooks, water-bottles and articles of clothing indiscriminately from one another without asking permission and without causing offence.

But it will not be imagined that the relations of brothers and sisters always proceed smoothly according to the preferred pattern of solidarity based on mutual identification, understanding, and support. Precisely because siblings are conceived by one another and by outsiders as occupying in many respects similar status roles, their performances may be compared and evaluated, and the resulting rivalry may lead to envy, and at a further remove, to open enmity. The danger of such competition to the solidarity of the family is particularly acute in a community where social relations outside the family are largely regulated by the struggle for prestige. If a brother sees the possibility of winning the applause of outsiders, although it may be at his brother's expense, he may be very tempted to take the opportunity. The danger is greatest in situations where individual skills or qualities, for instance abilities as a shepherd or as a dancer, the proof of courage or the possession of a fine physique, may become the basis for judging differences between brothers. And outsiders delight in making and voicing such judgements because they appreciate the strains they may cause. In other situations, there may be a desire to escape the effects of public disapproval for the action of a sibling even though this involves disloyalty. 'Hang my brother, I am too busy' (κρεμάστε τὸν ἀδερφό μου, ἐγὼ δὲν ἀδειάζω) is a proverb which expresses this idea with a certain astringency.

The effective sanction against such behaviour is simply the knowledge that while a quarrel between brothers which is not known and talked about outside the family generally allows

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

some hope of reconciliation, a quarrel that follows on the public humiliation of a brother very often leads to a permanent estrangement. Such an estrangement seriously affects the prestige of all the members of the family and destroys the solidarity of a group on which unmarried brothers and, in the early years of marriage, married brothers are almost wholly dependent.

But rivalry between brothers is also inhibited in two other ways; by the dogma of the equality of siblings of the same sex; and by the fiction of the specialization of technical roles.

It is a truism that equals are rivals. Rivalry, here, is an attempt to upset the pattern of equality which then provokes in others reciprocal attempts to reassert once more the original relation of equality. However, in so far as there exists a precise equality in rights and duties between siblings of the same sex, and to the extent that other members of the family refuse to discriminate between brothers or sisters, the possibility of disruptive rivalry is checked. All unmarried siblings of the same sex have exactly equivalent rights and duties. Brothers are equally committed to the duties of vengeance in the defence of family honour; they are similarly entitled to an exactly equal patrimony. Sisters have the same rights to adequate dowries with which honourable marriages may be arranged for them. In lesser matters, too, the equality of brothers implies the notion of equal shares. A ten-year-old boy returning home from a cherry-picking expedition with bulging pockets at once spread out his loot and divided the fruit with scrupulous care between his two younger brothers, himself, and a sister. Lacking a single cherry to make four equivalent heaps, he gave the fractionally smaller portion to the sister.

It is significant that a parent will never admit to liking one of his children in preference to another. He will agree that, of course, sons are more important than daughters, but he is quick to add that they are all his children and that to show any discrimination would be sinful. Practice confirms this assertion. One child is often clearly more gifted or attractive than another, yet parents take great care to give the same affection to all their children. Adult Sarakatsani act with a conscious self-discipline in these matters since they are well aware of the

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

593 858 dangerous consequences of envy (ζήλεια). 'There is not enough room in the pen for the envious sheep' (τὸ ζηλιάρικο ἀρνὶ μὲς τὸ μαντρὶ δὲ χωράει), it is said.

593 582 A person's position in the birth order of the sibling group is part of his fate; therefore it is considered right that siblings of the same sex should marry strictly in order of seniority. There are no exceptions to this rule. It removes from the sphere of competition a matter which, in the case of brothers, is intimately

593 connected with status and prestige. Similarly, it is normally the

● 578 eldest brother who becomes head of the family after the retirement of the father. Thus, the question of succession to this position does not provoke rivalry between brothers. Only rarely does a younger brother take the position of leadership in preference to a senior brother who may be temperamentally unsuited to the position of responsibility. But, in general, authority is an element foreign to the relations of siblings of the same sex. The position of family head, when it is held by a brother, is treated as merely one of a number of specialized tasks which different brothers must undertake. Important decisions are, in fact, arrived at through a consensus of opinion.

593 578 461 463 Rivalry between brothers is also discouraged by the specialization of technical roles.[5] Shepherding in the Zagori country demands skill, resource and, sometimes, daring. His success or failure in this activity considerably affects the prestige of the Sarakatsanos. But within the family the fiction is maintained with considerable vehemence that each brother is a specialist at his own task. In the family of Theodoros it is said that Theodoros, the head of the family, has a certain ability as an efficient negotiator with the outside world; Demetrios is a specialist cheese-maker and muleteer; only Eleutherios knows certain high places in the winter pastures where the sterile ewes will thrive and recover their fertility; Vasili is a specialist in fattening up the lambs and young sheep; and Aristoteles is said to have some intuitive facility for the management of the milking ewes. It is a fact, however, that all the brothers are quite capable of undertaking any task of animal husbandry

[5] An early statement of the idea that competitive pressures are eased by qualitative differentiation of roles is perhaps to be found in E. Durkheim, *The Division of Labour in Society*, translated by Simpson, Glencoe Illinois, 1949, p. 266.

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

and that this does occur in various emergencies without any apparent loss of efficiency. But the important point is that the belief is firmly held that each is better than anybody else in his own department; and for the well-being of the family, each department is essential. On the other hand, where brothers are found alongside one another in the performance of the same task, rivalry is almost always present. If brothers are milking a flock of ewes there is invariably an argument about who has drawn off the most milk. Similarly, at the spring shearing the speed and efficiency of the cutting is a matter for competition and debate. Such rivalry is generally acted out as a form of play, yet it causes sufficient sullenness and passing bad-temper to indicate the importance of the differentiation of technical roles which has been described.

Although the Sarakatsani insist upon the mutual devotion of brothers they recognize that brothers do sometimes quarrel seriously. Such a development strikes at the unity of the family and threatens the horror of fratricide. 'When two brothers quarrel, two madmen rejoice' (Δυὸ ἀδέρφια μάλλωναν καὶ δυὸ τρελλοὶ χαίρονταν), as a proverb expresses it. But the consequences of a serious quarrel between brothers partly depend on the stage of development reached by the family. Quarrels between adolescent brothers are quickly extinguished by the father's authority, and in differences between unmarried but adult brothers the pressure of elder brothers and parents is generally sufficient to bring the contestants to reason. It is possible for an adult unmarried son to claim his share of the sheep and leave the family, but one man and a hundred sheep do not, in this community, form a viable economic and domestic unit. Even a married pair do not. To some degree, brothers are dependent on one another for many years, often, indeed, until their own sons are in late adolescence. It is said that if brothers quarrel today, tomorrow they will be talking again because, 'The one has need of the other'. 'Blood' (αἷμα), and 'necessity' (ἀνάγκη), provide the motivation and the sanction for fraternal solidarity.

Quarrels between married brothers with separate households are more likely to lead to a break in relations, particularly if some of their children have finished school. The factor of importance, then, is whether the quarrel took place in public

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

593 with mutual insult. If it did, it is very likely to end all forms of
578 co-operation. But if the parents of the brothers are still alive, even a quarrel of these dimensions may sometimes be healed.

593 The ties between unmarried sisters are particularly close. If dishonour attaches to one sister, it infects them all. Together, passively and modestly, they await with anxiety for some stranger to ask for their hand, an event which is both dreaded and desired. Unlike the brothers who separate to carry out their different work, the sisters are constantly in one another's company and are often working together at the same task. Their relationship differs from that of brothers in the absence of any considerable rivalry. While brothers stand in the public gaze, sisters are closeted within the privacy of domestic life.
[557] The reputation of a girl does not depend upon positive self-
[536] assertion, but rather on the passive preservation of her virginal condition. She succeeds in this through the closest possible association with her sisters; their physical inseparability is her
[572] chief defence against the slander of enemies. Differences in
[582] physical beauty may cause some jealousy but these are facts which cannot be altered and, since sisters in any case marry strictly in order of seniority, competition to snare a husband
[461] does not exist. The absence of competitive attitudes between sisters means that any elaborate fiction of differentiated roles is unnecessary, and sisters work happily and amicably at the same task without any serious comparison of productivity or skill.[1]

The ties between brother and sister are also close. Here again, from the viewpoint of the outsider, brothers and sisters are identified as children of the same parents; the short-comings of a sister reflect upon the brother, and vice versa. But the difference of sex introduces into the relationship an important
[627] element of complementarity. The brother is the guardian of his sister from rape and insult and he must avenge any violation
[584] of her person or character. If his father has retired, it is the duty of the eldest brother, with his father's consent and guidance, to
[582] arrange for his sister an honourable marriage. And the youngest brother in a sibling group must remain unmarried until all the sisters have been settled.

[1] Young sisters or cousins sometimes compete to see who can spin more quickly than the other. And they mark a cross on the forehead of the loser with a piece of charcoal. But these are games played in an atmosphere of great hilarity and goodwill.

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

transcended the inferiority of her sex and becomes the focus of her sons' co-operation within the extended family, or later in a group of autonomous households. Only she is able successfully to mediate and contain the conflicting loyalties of married brothers.

It is clear that the various difficulties between parents and children are all related in some degree to the necessary involvement of the individual and his family in the community's system of prestige values. When the child begins to play a representative role outside the family the father has to educate and discipline it in a way that puts a considerable strain on a small boy or girl. An adolescent son in adopting the prescribed attitudes of manliness becomes abrupt to his mother. The adult 'pallikari' is particularly sensitive to his public reputation for honour and self-assertion, and it is this that bedevils his relations with his father. Thus the peculiarly clear-cut complementarity of the parental roles has to do with the fact that when the relation of a child (particularly a son) to one of his parents is strained, the relation to the other parent is one of positive attachment and identification.

In this complex of family roles and relationships the ties between parents and children represent the core of the system. The categorical obligations of parents towards their children are the values underlying the isolation of the family. They are values which in the popular mind are supported by their reference to a divine model, to the unmotivated love of God, to the patient devotion of the Mother of Christ. But sons and daughters must also be educated to conformity with the system of values of the wider community which makes demands even on small children; requires self-discipline and self-assertion in youths; and places young men and their fathers in competitive opposition while the former advance to adult status and independence. Throughout this process of development the moral solidarity of the family must remain unbroken. And this, in effect, is the achievement of the complementary structure of the two parental roles and their reciprocals.

It seems that there are three important contexts in which the stability of family relations may be threatened by conflict from within. In the first case, the integrity and solidarity of the family is destroyed when a female member willingly

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

593 578 compromises her sexual honour. Secondly, there is the danger of competitive differences between a father who has not yet retired and his adult but unmarried sons. Thirdly, the rivalry inherent in the relations of brothers is a continuing threat to the solidarity of the family. It grows in inverse proportion to the degree of authority which the father is able to exert, and to the extent that brothers are dependent on one another for co-operative assistance. In each of these instances, we have already reviewed particular sanctions and institutionalized arrangements which generally help to prevent altogether, or to keep within tolerable limits, these types of disruptive behaviour. 593 571 578 But in each of these instances, there is also the positive sanction of the mutual identification of interests and the responsibility of all members of the family for the actions of other members, attitudes which follow from a common opposition to all those persons who are not members of the family. And it is to the consideration of the solidarity of corporate family groups, which is a consequence of their mutual hostility, that we turn in the following pages.

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

person of his violator. On the other hand, the family of the original killer do not have to suffer the consequences of passive solidarity; a brother, father, or son of the killer is not generally an object of vengeance. But despite the absence of passive solidarity in vengeance killing, the ideal course of a vendetta is still visualized as terminating in the mutual extinction of the two families. As we shall see, this is most unlikely to occur in practice. It is generally to a brother or son, more especially the former, that the duty of vengeance killing for murder falls. A father is seldom involved, for women and children are inviolate, and only in the case of the killing of an only son without issue will he be left as the one possible avenger. Normally, an unmarried brother avenges a brother, a son his father, when the latter has no unmarried brother.

During the period 1945–55 it seems that only two successful killings have occurred amongst the Sarakatsani that were specifically vengeance for a previous murder, although for the same period I have details of varying completeness concerning seven other killings for various causes (other than the hostilities of the 1947–9 civil war). One reason for the low incidence of vengeance killing is that the killer is generally removed or removes himself from the scene of action immediately after the event. Today, the Greek police are well organized and omnipresent. Generally, killings occur either as the result of boundary disputes or questions of honour, so that the identity of a killer is widely known. He is quickly arrested and finds asylum in prison. When he is released from prison some five to ten years later, his kinsmen will advise him whether the victim has a brother or son able to revenge him, and depending on the nature of this advice the killer will either return to the community or move to another district of the Epirus or to Thessaly. Therefore, in most cases, the absence of passive solidarity in blood vengeance and the removal of the killer to prison and later to voluntary exile prevents the execution of vengeance. Exile is clearly not so honourable an outcome as a vengeance killing for the victim's family, but it strikes some kind of rough balance between the two groups. It relieves the avenger of the need to spend a number of years in prison, followed possibly by exile. The killer himself is believed to suffer considerably in his exile, distant from the support of his family and kinsmen. And it is the

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

reputation for manliness of the victim's group which has driven him there. 596 577

But if all the dead man's brothers are married, he is unlikely to be avenged. A married brother's obligations to his own family take precedence. If he were to kill the murderer he would be removed to prison, and afterwards would face exile or possible counter-vengeance. In either event his family would be deprived of its head at a time when the sons were almost certainly still children or adolescents. Yet the consciences of married men with an unavenged brother are never altogether easy. If the dead man has a son, however young, they feel less troubled. For this son will be expected to revenge his father before he marries. However, by the time the son is mature enough to act, the killer is probably an old man and removed from the public scene. In this situation a son tends to put off the execution of his duty in the hope that the murderer will soon die naturally without his assistance. 627

If the dead man has an unmarried brother, ideally the latter may not marry until the murderer has been killed or driven into exile. But if the dead man has also a son, even though it is still in the cradle, he will probably take a wife; particularly if the killer has a long sentence to serve. If the dead man has no son, an unmarried brother will certainly wait until the murderer emerges from prison, but if the latter does not then return to the community the brother will probably consider himself free to marry a year or two afterwards.

Yet despite the dearth of reciprocal vengeance killings, the idea of this obligation is very real, and it remains a potent sanction against light-hearted killings in a community with a taste for violence. Of five Sarakatsan murderers released from prison in recent years, three moved to other parts of Greece, and the two who returned to the community only did so because their victims had left no ready avenger on the scene.

The details of a vengeance killing which occurred in 1950 illustrate some aspects of the problem. During the civil war of 1947–9 the Sarakatsani were unable to reach their summer grazing in the mountains and remained in the plains of Thesprotia under conditions of extreme heat and absence of grass. There was a boundary dispute between the extended family group of Achnoulas and a 'company' of families led by John Stratos. [221] [578]

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

of opinion is likely to be favourable to a policy of inaction but mutual avoidance. There is, inevitably, some loss of prestige but this may be the lesser of two evils. But mutual avoidance (which is possible in this dispersed community) is essential. If the killer were to appear before the victim's brothers on a public occasion, such as a wedding or a festival, the humiliating confrontation would force the brothers to kill him or forfeit their honour. Generally, both sides have strong motives to keep out of each other's way. In the case of the vengeance killing between the Achnoulas and Stratos families, after some months the Stratos family may have felt relief that they did not know the identity of the killer. But the incident at the wedding was generally interpreted as a display of public boasting by George Achnoulas, and this made retaliation almost inevitable.

The loss of a life in a killing is seen as a loss of blood, and for this outrage the violator ought to pay with his own blood. We have shown that there is no passive solidarity in vengeance killing; a man does not generally suffer for a killing committed by his brother. This is a convention which plainly restricts the possible extensions of a vengeance killing and prevents a number of families from losing their 'protectors'. It is the analogue of those qualifications of active solidarity that we have already discussed. However, this does not detract from the importance of active and passive solidarity in other situations nor the significance of the shedding of the common blood. This is very evident in fights which do not involve homicide.

An evenly contested fight in which no blood is spilled is an episode complete in itself; a fight of similar character and proportions in which one side physically loses blood but the other does not, inevitably provokes its own sequel in the attempt at some later time to draw blood from the opponent. But a man does not himself revenge the outrage which has been committed on him. This is the task of a brother or son. Also, the object of vengeance need not be the original opponent; any male member of this man's family is appropriate. In a typical dispute over the boundaries of grazing areas, Aristoteles was cut about the head by the other shepherd's crook. Some weeks later, Christos, the brother of Aristoteles, found himself at a wedding feast opposite the brother of the man who had recently quarrelled with his own brother. In his own words, 'I suddenly saw

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

him there, drinking and putting on airs. I remembered that his brother Vasili drew blood from my brother. I could not stand it.' The consequences for the other man was a head wound from a broken bottle before the two men were parted and expelled from the wedding. It has to be remembered that fights and brawls in which individuals have the duty of both active and passive solidarity are relatively frequent, but that killings are rare.

The second category of affairs of honour concerns the sexual conduct of women. The family has exclusive rights over the sexual capacities of its women, and in this respect women always remain *in loco filiae*. Here we are concerned not only with external attack as in the spilling of blood, but also, sometimes, with treason from within when a daughter or sister betrays her virginity or when a wife voluntarily commits adultery. The will of a woman is vulnerable and her sensuality is evil. She is the weak link in the chain. For this very reason her sexual purity is an appropriate symbol of the family's honour. Its destruction, although itself a dishonourable act, in some way places the destroyer and his family in a position of superiority; for they have demonstrated that the woman is willing to abandon sacred loyalties for the gratification of her sensual feelings by a stranger. In these circumstances vengeance becomes primarily an act of purification. A father (or brother) must first destroy his daughter (or sister) and only afterwards turn his attention to the lover. Similarly, a husband ought first to kill a wife taken in adultery and then the paramour.

If it seems surprising that such violence may occur in a group whose jural and affective solidarity I have been at some pains to stress, this nevertheless seems to be a characteristic of small groups whose solidarity is very intense. In the mutual identification of one member with another, there is no flexibility to contain widely divergent interests. We have seen that brothers, if they cannot reach unanimous decisions, must part company. Similarly, the association of family members demands absolute loyalty; the treachery of one member disrupts the group in such a way that this member's very presence is a denial of the qualities and attitudes on which the harmony of its internal relations depends. The objectionable element must, therefore, be excised. This is the only way in which the family honour can be

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

less effective is the response. To some extent this is so even where the reasons for delay are physical: for instance, the killer is in prison, or the avenger is not yet adult. But it is said that if an affront to honour remained unanswered over a period of years after an adult unmarried avenger was available and the killer physically present in the community, then the quality of the dishonour ascribed to the family would be such that an eventual vengeance killing would not reinstate the reputation of the victim's family. For, on grounds of damaging conjectures about the personal motives for this delay, other families would be able to continue asserting the relative integrity of their own honour by denying it to the family of the victim. The case is hypothetical since there has been no instance of this kind in recent years, but it is indicative of Sarakatsan thinking on this matter.

The defence of family honour is at once an indication of family solidarity and a process which recreates it. The honour of the family, the solidarity of this group, and the mutual responsibility of its members, are correlated notions. It is true that passive solidarity does not extend to questions of vengeance where a life is demanded, but in other respects it is complete. A man may suffer physical assault for the offence of his father, brother, or son. Further, if one member of a family acts dishonourably, all the other members of the family lose honour in the eyes of the community. If a man is killed or a sister's betrothal is broken, and the family remains inactive, all its members are equally dishonoured. Since all are responsible for the actions of any one, every member is accountable to every other member. All the members of the family necessarily form a single solidary group for the protection of their common honour.

2. HOSTILITY BETWEEN UNRELATED FAMILIES

In the preceding chapters we have seen that for each individual this community is divided into the two opposite but complementary categories of kinsmen and strangers; trust marking relations in the one category, distrust in the other. Distrust prevents co-operation between shepherds who are not kinsmen or affines, and the four or five men that are necessary to manage a flock are either father and sons or a co-operative 'company' of kinsmen and relatives by marriage. Moreover, the produce of the

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

609 flock is sold to persons outside the community. Moreover, the produce of the
609 who remains a member of the community acts as a trader or
578 shopkeeper. Indeed, unrelated families are only dependent on one another in two significant ways, for marriage partners and social reputation. In both instances this form of dependence helps to breed hostility and suspicion, which is all the more intense since there are no other forms of social or economic co-operation. Perhaps, too, the dispersed character of the community, and the fact that for most of the time shepherds are bound to the care of their animals, allow attitudes of intense hostility without giving too frequent opportunities for its physical expression.

571 The hostility that exists between unrelated families is en-
609 couraged by the belief that their interests are mutually destruc-
578 tive. There is the story that after he had created the other
829 countries, God had a few stones and rocks left in his sack. He
[903] threw these over his shoulder and they became the land of Greece. It is believed that there are not enough resources and wealth to satisfy the needs of everybody, and that therefore the success and prosperity of other families is necessarily a threat to the very existence of one's own. It follows that a man must rejoice when another suffers misfortune and 'falls in the mud' (πέφτει στὴ λάσπη). For the Sarakatsani, these beliefs have an immediate relevance. If the village President allots one man an area of good summer grass, another must receive an area of indifferent grazing. Again, in the winter, pasture is scarce, and every family that has successfully negotiated for its requirements of winter grass leaves less for the others. Whether it is a question of material assets or social prestige the Sarakatsani see life as a kind of seesaw. If one family goes up in the world the others must necessarily come down.

571 The hostility between unrelated families is intimately related
609 to the nature of rights and obligations inside the elementary
593 family. These have a diffuse character; that is to say, a man is
578 obliged to support his brothers, sisters, parents, or children in every situation and circumstance unless this assistance conflicts with other and higher obligations. But not only do all a man's significant interests fall within the limits of the family, but in most contexts loyalty to the family is the supreme social value. Moreover, there is no social group in this community

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

which through common membership can commit him to any duty towards persons with whom he is not related by kinship or marriage. Indeed, any relationship with an unrelated person would be regarded by other members of the family as a form of betrayal. For a man's energies and affections belong to his family and his relatives, and to nobody else. This explains why personal friendship with an unrelated person, based simply on liking and sympathy, is impossible. There is devoted friendship between cousins, but even here we have seen that such an association is immediately sacrificed if any friction develops between the two families. The solidarity of the family resides in its exclusiveness and opposition to those who do not belong. And any relationship between one of its members and an outsider, which is not shared by the others, necessarily weakens it.

The mutual distrust of unrelated families emerges very clearly on those rare occasions when for some specific purpose they are forced into co-operation. During the summer a hut is established high in the mountains above the village so that the various shepherds who have sold their milk to a particular merchant are able to deliver it twice a day to his agents who at once turn it into cheese. Towards the end of July these operations come to an end, and it is then the responsibility of those selling their milk to the merchant to carry down to the village on their mules the machinery, utensils, and the mass of accumulated cheeses. The cheese-maker and his assistant calculate from their books the total quantity of milk which each family has delivered during the whole summer, and in proportion to these quantities each family is allotted so many mule-loads of cheeses and equipment, which it is their duty to transport as far as the village. But the assessment of these loads by the cheese-maker is not accepted without many amendments and bitter wrangling. The cream separator for instance is a heavy, awkward thing to load on a mule. Who is to say what the equivalent in cheeses or smaller pieces of equipment may be? Each family is determined not to be outmanœuvred by the others into performing any service which can possibly be avoided, and no trust is placed by anybody in the impartiality of the cheese-maker. It sometimes happens that the family which has sold the largest quantity of milk has only one mule, while another group with only a small flock possesses three or four pack

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

571 609 578 476 234 animals. But this never leads to a comradely offer of assistance which might finish the task in a single mule train. A man with a single animal may have to struggle three or four times in the day up and down to the village while the man with three or four mules sits and watches as his animals graze in idleness.

All social relations between unrelated persons are pervaded by this attitude of distrust. We may recall how sometimes in marriage negotiations the girl's family try to conceal her shortcomings and attempt by implication to suggest that a more attractive younger sister is the prospective bride. A man and his family distrust unrelated people because they expect to be exploited and tricked by them. They admit that they themselves would act in a similar manner. They say that a man must protect his family, and to do this in the world as he finds it some cunning and some lies are necessary.

571 609 578 685 554 Before 1937, the mutual hostility of unrelated families found an institutionalized form of expression in the custom of 'animal theft' (ζωοκλοπή), more especially of sheep. Although the severity of the penalties introduced by the government of Metaxas effectively stifled this activity almost overnight, most of the heads of families are old enough to remember the alarms and excitements of sheep theft. The desire to steal is still privately expressed (and occasionally indulged in) and the qualities of courage and intelligence which were necessary in these adventures are still the ideal attributes of the hero and 'pallikari'. As we shall see, theft of another sort has now replaced it. But one cannot doubt that but for the pressure of the State law sheep theft would still be a vigorous institution.

The more general form of sheep theft was the small-scale expedition undertaken by a lone individual or in company with one or two trusted kinsmen. The object was to steal one or two sheep from the flock of an unrelated man, transport the animals with speed to the huts of the families involved where the sheep were at once killed, roasted, and eaten, as a precaution against 602 the discovery of incriminating evidence. Sheep were never stolen from kinsmen or affines and generally not from other flocks in the immediate vicinity. This precaution was taken not from any neighbourly spirit, but because it was realized that, if two neighbouring groups engaged in a sequence of theft and counter-theft, shepherding would soon become impossible, and the

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

strength of both flocks would rapidly be reduced to vanishing point. The evidence suggests that small-scale theft was not generally found among those families using the grazing lands of the same village, but was concentrated on the flocks within the territory of immediately neighbouring villages, that is to say in an area some 5–10 miles distant from the homesteads of the thieves. But at this distance an expedition became a planned undertaking requiring the absence of shepherds for perhaps two days and nights from their own sheep, a circumstance which significantly limited the frequency of these raids. It is extremely difficult to assess what was the frequency, but it seems unlikely that the average family enjoyed this sport more often than four or five times in a summer.

The Sarakatsani justify animal theft on the grounds that before 1937 a man could not provide his family with enough food without stolen meat. It was, therefore, an honourable undertaking. Moreover, since other men stole your animals, both interest and honour demanded retaliation. The older men are lyrical about the satisfaction of eating a stolen sheep by moonlight. A man only kills his own animals for meat at important social and religious celebrations, and then with reluctance. The stolen sheep was a luxury, a luxury at the enemy's expense.

After these expeditions, a shepherd was torn between the precaution of secrecy and the desire to win renown for the daring and cleverness of his exploits. He would openly boast about the number of sheep he had recently lifted, but would not generally reveal their original owner. The latter, however, on his own account or through the reports of kinsmen, formed certain shrewd suspicions. In any event, whether he suspected the identity of the thief or not, he had to take some retaliatory action on somebody since otherwise he would not only become a laughing-stock, but a prey to other thieves sensing an easy victim. The best defence against theft was swift retaliation with interest. Even where a man was sure of the thief's identity, his retaliation against the flock of the stani of which the thief was a member might not fall on a sheep or sheep which belonged to the original thief. Therefore, in either instance, an original act of sheep theft might lead to a series of thefts not necessarily confined to the original participants.

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

571 609 578 685 There existed also a more ambitious form of sheep theft, which was less often attempted, partly because of the considerable danger and partly because it made even greater demands on the time and energy of the thieves than the variety already described. Three or four kinsmen, travelling swiftly from their homes, arrived at the victims' grazing land about dusk. As soon as it grew dark, they cut out fifty or so sheep and, using a carefully prospected route, drove the animals through the hours of darkness to a secluded river bed or forest clearing, which was distant both from the thieves' own home and the home of the victim. From this place of relative security, the animals were delivered in batches to some Jannina livestock merchant for slaughter; the latter would ask no questions, but also paid a price less than the market rate. Sometimes the ear-signs on the animals were carefully altered and the animals were added, some to the flocks of the thieves, and others to those of kinsmen who lived at a distance from the victim. Care was taken to arrange a wide distribution of the animals so that the chances of recognition were less than if the animals remained together in a single body. For reasons analogous to those already given for the avoidance of small-scale sheep theft on the flocks of immediate neighbours, these more ambitious operations were carried out at even greater distance from the homes of the raiders, generally at the farthest limit of the community some 15–20 miles distant, or on the flocks of Koutsovlachs beyond the community boundary. Fear of massive retaliation also prevented men from boasting about this kind of exploit, at least until some years after the event. Secrecy was essential. Nevertheless, the prestige motive was not altogether lacking from these thefts, since wealth, either in money or in sheep, was an important element in the prestige standing of a family.

Before 1937 it seems possible to distinguish, in very broad outline, three areas and modes of hostility. Towards unrelated families, within a radius of some five miles from a family's own sheep, hostility was expressed in attitude rather than act. There existed constant distrust and suspicion, but an avoidance of provocation. In the second area, stretching beyond the first to a distance of ten miles and often somewhat farther, hostility found expression in the small-scale theft of sheep; the frequency of these acts, however, was limited by considerations of time and

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

distance and perhaps a certain moderation sanctioned by the fear of too many reprisals. In the third and farthest area of the community, any individual family only rarely, and possibly never, undertook hostile raiding operations on an ambitious scale; here again the frequency of these acts was limited by considerations of time and distance, and more certainly by the fear of retaliation. According to the distance which separated unrelated families, there was a certain inverse relation between the frequency of hostile contact and the severity of its manner of expression.

The vigorous measures of Metaxas ended extensive sheep theft. But today hostility still finds a parallel form of expression. Since 1937 the sheep population of the Zagori has considerably increased, with the result that the lands of most of the summer villages are over-grazed; it is now the constant anxiety of each group that its animals may not find enough grass to mate effectively and resist disease, let alone return a good milk yield. At the beginning of each summer, the President of the village allots to each family or 'company' grazing land in proportion to the size of each flock. If the number of Sarakatsan sheep entitled to graze on the land of the village increases, there is less grass for each sheep. In a very obvious sense the size and condition of a family's flock are threatened by the sheep of other families, and the grass they eat. It is now too dangerous to steal the sheep, but it is possible to steal the grass. During the summer heat, sheep are grazed at night; the technique of grass stealing is to pasture sheep just over the boundary dividing a man's own land from that of his immediate neighbour, but never so deeply into his territory that he cannot retreat rapidly at the approach of the other shepherd or the agricultural guard. It is the duty of this official to summon all offenders before the local agricultural court, where fines, generally of the order of two or three pounds, are levied. It is very doubtful if the value of the grass taken in the course of the trespassing is equivalent to the fines which are paid, even if the fact is ignored that a neighbour is almost certainly making similar raids in the opposite direction. The Sarakatsani are well aware of these facts, but they feel that inactivity would be weakness and would be so interpreted by the neighbouring groups. It is the consciousness and certainty of the hostile intent of other families threatening

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

571 609 233 578 685

the group from without which drives it to reciprocal action. There is no missing the intense satisfaction expressed by shepherds after a successful night's grazing on another's grass. Such acts define the exclusiveness and prepotency of a family group against other family groups and the world in general.

Under present-day conditions the distinction between different ways of showing enmity towards immediate neighbours and more distantly situated families is not so immediately clear, but nevertheless exists. In its relations with another family group using the grazing land of the same village, a family maintains a measure of restraint it would not be concerned to show in chance encounters with families which live at a distance. We have shown how a grass thief is careful never to stray too far across the boundary of his neighbour. He does not boast about these exploits, and if accused would deny that he was aware he had crossed the line. Similarly, the victim, unless he accidentally comes upon the thief red-handed, is unlikely to make wild or insulting accusations which transform an affair of limited hostility into a 'question of honour'. A man whose grass is being raided merely retaliates upon the thief, if he is not already doing so.

But a family has hostile relations of grass-stealing with only its immediate grazing neighbours. And since the summer pastures are reallotted each year a man is unlikely to have the same neighbours two years in succession. Therefore, over the years these hostilities are diffused, as it were, throughout the

571 609 578

local gathering of families. In general, shepherds who must live in or close to the same village express hostility in their attitudes rather than in their actions. An almost aggressive secrecy, the cloistered care of unmarried girls, the pleasure taken in the misfortunes of others and the fear of the evil eye, the slanderous vilification of all unrelated people and their motives, are indica-

576 521

tive of these attitudes. On the other hand, people are punctilious in their formal greetings when they meet. Women exchange careful and guarded conversation at the well, probing for information and avoiding the need to give it; but with civility. And their men drink in the coffee-shop and play cards with self-assertion but apparent *bonhomie*—yet always on guard for a possible slight, and always with a mental picture of who is for them, and who against, in the immediate vicinity.

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

During the spring and autumn migrations between the mountains and the plains, many thousands of sheep move along the main road from Jannina to the coastal area around and south of Igoumenitsa. On these occasions, men and their sheep who normally live at a distance find themselves head to tail on the same stretch of road, jostling one another for the meagre stretches of roadside grass, blocking one another's passage on the road, or travelling in the pall of dust raised by the flock in front. In these circumstances, families give a very free rein to their hostility, fights are frequent and sheep theft at night is one of the excitements of the road to which young men look forward. But if on these occasions a man finds himself immediately behind a flock with which he may share a boundary during the coming six months, he moves off the road and waits for half an hour until distance or another flock places a barrier between future neighbours. However, it would be wrong to interpret the relative restraint shown in relations with neighbouring families as reflecting any measure of co-operation. But shepherds and their sheep are peculiarly vulnerable to attack, and it is a structural imperative of such a community that hostility between groups living in close proximity be controlled, if only through their fear of mutual destruction.

Hostility is a kind of relationship, and providing it is limited in such a way that it cannot succeed in its ultimate aim, that is the annihilation of the adversary, it may represent an important element in the pattern of social relations of a community. This is the case among the Sarakatsani where the opportunities for the expression of open hostility are limited by the constant demands of the flocks on the shepherds' attention, and the circumstance that the shepherds and their animals are physically dispersed. Obviously the ability of one man to get at another is always an important factor in a relationship of hostility. But these behaviours are also controlled, partially at any rate, in the competitive forms through which they are acted out. And it is perhaps not unprofitable to consider theft in the general context of competitive gift exchange. The victim, both from honour and self-interest, is obliged to commit a counter-theft. Like the return gift in other societies, the return theft amongst the Sarakatsani should ideally be greater than the original theft. Like a series of prestations and counter-prestations, in theory a

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

571 578 685 series of thefts never ends, for after each reciprocal act an amount of debt remains.

The sheep are part of the family corporation, they are its source of life and wealth, and a family's prestige and pride are closely bound up with the size and condition of its flock. Each sheep and its eccentricities are individually known. The theft of a sheep from a family removes something more than a material object, it takes away also a spiritual value. Thus before 1937 the theft and counter-theft of sheep provided 'a pattern of spiritual bonds between things which are to some extent part of persons.'* The modern practice of stealing grass, although its effects are less direct, may be viewed in a similar way. Whereas gift exchange in other societies achieves a measure of co-operation between differentiated groups, amongst the Sarakatsani the reciprocal exchange of theft relates one family group to another in a nexus of debt, while at the same time it denies the need, or the possibility, of co-operation and stresses the mutual exclusiveness and opposition of unrelated families.

571 609 233 578 685 [554]

* * *

596 The analysis of family roles in the previous chapter revealed that the solidarity of the family was vulnerable in certain important respects. These were the loss of sexual honour by a woman of the family, and competition between father and son or between brothers. In the first part of this chapter I have discussed certain values and institutions which support the intense solidarity of the Sarakatsan family and are in various ways sanctions against the potentially deviant attitudes described in the analysis of family roles; for instance, there were ideas about blood, divorce, illegitimacy, secrecy; and institutions of corporate property and family honour. In the final section of this chapter certain beliefs about the inevitable opposition and hostility of unrelated families have been examined as well as some institutions through which they are expressed. And this reciprocal exchange of hostility represents a further sanction that encourages the identification of the interests and affections of family members in opposition to all who do not belong.

596 609 578

[11.3] * Marcel Mauss, *The Gift*, translated by Ian Cunnison, London, 1954, p. 11.

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

[p.263]

X

THE VALUES OF PRESTIGE[1]

1. THE HIERARCHY

A CONSIDERATION of the bilateral kindred and the marriage prohibitions associated with it has shown that the only relatively enduring kin group in the Sarakatsan system of kinship and marriage is the elementary family. I have placed considerable emphasis on the concentration of most of the individual's significant obligations within this group; and these normally take precedence over any other moral commitments. It is a feature of evident importance that the community is fragmented into about six hundred of these exclusive corporate family groups.

Within the community these families are jurally autonomous. It is true that they must often co-operate with kinsmen or affines in the management of their sheep. And in particular though rare circumstances when the honour of the community is in question, men who are unrelated may stand together against villagers and others. Nevertheless, in none of these situations is the sovereignty of the family compromised. Moreover, unrelated families see their different interests as being in fundamental and inevitable opposition. We have already examined various attitudes and institutions through which this mutual hostility is expressed, for instance attitudes of intense secrecy and distrust, and institutions of sheep-theft and mutual trespass. Hostility directed outwards is, of course, the counterpart of the immensely strong jural and affective solidarity of the family. And both are conditions consistent with the system

[1] In some respects there are obvious parallels with Homeric society, and I have benefited by the work of Sir Maurice Bowra, *Tradition and Design in the Iliad*, Oxford, 1930; Bruno Snell, *The Discovery of the Mind*, translated by Rosenmeyer, Oxford, 1953; M. I. Finley, *The World of Odysseus*, London, 1956; and Arthur W. H. Adkins, *Merit and Responsibility*, Oxford, 1960.

Anybody considering the values of a Mediterranean culture is under an obligation to J. A. Pitt-Rivers, *People of the Sierra*, London, 1954. Bichr Farès, *L'Honneur chez les Arabes avant L'Islam*, Paris, 1932, is an interesting attempt to discuss a somewhat similar system of values on strict principles of Durkheimian sociology.

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

of patronage that links each family individually to the wider structure of Greek society.

But, clearly, there is a limit to the amount of openly expressed hostility that this community is able to tolerate. Shepherds and their sheep are vulnerable, and in practice prudence discourages the free expression of hostility. The reciprocal trespass practised by shepherds who share a common grazing boundary is generally confined to areas from which there is a secure line of retreat; and in grazing disputes shepherds are careful to fight with weapons which may cause unpleasant wounds but are unlikely to kill. Wanton murders are discouraged through the removal of the killer by imprisonment, voluntary exile, or vengeance. By whatever agency this may occur, the family is too small a group to afford the loss of a man, and only an imperative obligation of honour justifies such a risk.

But this relatively limited display of active hostility is not in balance with the unequivocal character of the oppositions between families unrelated by kinship or marriage. These find a more extended and satisfactory expression in competitive behaviour and values which have been mentioned so frequently. The sociological importance of competition[1] is precisely that it represents a kind of opposition which is often indirect. In this instance protagonists compete for social prestige, that is for something which in material form none of them possesses. Where the prize has this intangible quality, direct attack may be irrelevant. Indeed, since social prestige requires the favourable response of the community to a man's qualities and actions after these have been evaluated in terms of the accepted system of values, it depends overwhelmingly on the opinions of enemies. To oppose successfully other unrelated families in terms of prestige, men must compete to the limit in their adherence to these values. They do this without causing one another obvious material harm; and the more they oppose one another in this way, the more they affirm their support of a particular system of values and beliefs. In this context competition for social prestige, while it clearly encourages that family particularism of which it is itself a symptom, nevertheless gives to this competitive complex a certain unity and coherence through a common system of values. These are, as it were, the rules of the game.

[1] Georg Simmel, *Conflict*, translated by Wolff, Glencoe, Illinois, 1955, p. 57.

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

archetypal patterns of behaviour. Female values are referred to the ideal conduct of the Mother of God: modesty, virginal attitudes, and selfless love. Male values appear in different exemplars. Christ is the ideal of continence and selfless sacrifice even of life for those to whom one is committed: the horsed and warlike saints George and Demetrius present the pattern of assertive courage, physical, spiritual, and invulnerable. Nearer to the realities of a shepherd's life, these two aspects of ideal manliness meet in the legendary image of the klephtic hero, a man who so refined his powers of courage and continence that he partly transcended the limitations of the material world. Bullets could not find their mark on Katsandonis. Shepherds in Zagori know the place where he leaped his horse a hundred paces across a chasm. Such heroes are both prepotent and efficient. Whatever the odds, these men always defeat their enemy, except in the final contest when only the pre-ordained moment of fate and the presence of Charon succeed in taking away life. The last struggle of the hero, although hopeless, is heroic, a final flourish of his essentially human worth in the face of fate. But, in the end, honour wins over death and the hero lives on in the songs that commemorate his fame.

Men and women, then, struggle to attain these ideal modes of being and conduct. Where they fall too far short in the effort of identification honour is lost. As I have said earlier, honour and the two sex-linked values of manliness and shame, which are associated with it, are qualities that, in principle, the majority of families are presumed to possess. It is the natural birthright of most Sarakatsani to be manly and of their sisters to have shame. Therefore, in the sense that τιμή is used by the Sarakatsani, it is difficult to talk of competition to win more honour than another man or another family. Honour is something which most families are presumed to have, but which they may very easily lose if they do not guard it with all their resources of courage and self-discipline. There is, rather, a constant struggle to maintain an ideal state of equality in honour between most individuals and families. And since the downfall of one family validates and in some sense improves the status of other families, men attempt by every means of allusive gossip and criticism of conduct to deny each other their pretensions to honour.

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

are rigidly segregated, and the categorical opposition is evident. For in this context women are always a potential threat to the honour of men whether the latter are kinsmen or strangers. Thus unrelated persons of opposite sex seldom speak except to exchange a curt and conventional 'good day' if they meet on a narrow path. Although a man calls out a greeting to an unmarried girl, she keeps her eyes on the ground and never replies. At weddings unrelated persons of opposite sex, even though they are members of the same kindred of the bride or the groom, may not speak to one another. On these occasions the two sexes hold their feasting and dancing separately. In recent years at village festivals unrelated Sarakatsani of both sexes sometimes dance in the same ring but a woman is always flanked on both sides by men to whom she is related.

Within the group of related families which co-operate in the management of sheep, there are occasions when this opposition is expressed in accepted attitudes of sexual solidarity. If a number of women are working together on a common task such as the building of a hut, a group of men with nothing better to occupy their time will stand about smoking while they freely criticize their women's craftsmanship, and even revile them for their more general faults of ugliness and cunning. From time to time one of the more senior women will attempt some reply. 'Men', she calls out, 'are lazy good-for-nothings who do nothing but talk.' These exchanges begin in tones of banter but sometimes, in the later stages, they find sharp edges. In family life a favourite topic of evening conversation is a debate on the relative contributions and sacrifices which are made by the men and the women of the family for its well-being and security. This kind of talk is good-humoured but serves to draw out and emphasize what is expected of male and female roles.

Women face a hard and merciless routine of work and suffering. *Camaraderie* and the consciousness of a common fate help them to face it. This aspect of the solidarity of women is often expressed in the frequent discussion among those related by kinship or marriage of their common subjection to men in sexual activity. There is a great deal of bawdy reference to the male sex organs, and women constantly speak of their dislike of sexual intercourse and the absence of physical pleasure they find in it.

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

He was simple and innocent (ἁπλὸς καὶ ἀθῶος); not simple in the meaning of an absence of intelligence but in a simple singleness of purpose; and innocent in the sense of freedom from guilt or the need to use guile. Such young men, Demetrios added, since they do not know women, are παστρικοί, that is, clean and pure. Male virginity is the ideal. And continence is thought to confer a certain invulnerability on those who face dangers, especially the danger of bullets in war or brigandage. Of sex relations in marriage Aristoteles, a young man of 28, who in every way conforms in conduct and person to the ideal pallikari pattern, was able to say before other men that he was ashamed even to think of them. Sex, sin, and death are related; similarly virginity, continence, and life. The Sarakatsani anticipate marriage with joy, but also with regret. The founding of a family is wholly good, yet marriage, sex relations, and children, inevitably foreshadow death. The pallikari, not the head of family, is the ideal of manhood.

It is during these years of early manhood that the community begins seriously to take stock of a man. His marriage will be the means of linking two families in affinal alliance, and the assessment of his manliness is one factor which, in part, determines how other people will treat his family. When he is twenty or twenty-one years old and shortly before he goes on military service, he will grow a moustache, and his father, or brother, will buy him a broad-bladed dagger. These are the outward symbols of his assumption of the status of manhood and of his pretension to be a pallikari.

The community will gradually form an opinion of his prowess as a shepherd, his fearlessness on the high ridges, his devotion to a sick or injured sheep, and his skill in grazing. It is difficult to say how this opinion is formed, since unrelated shepherds seldom work together. Possibly the estimate is sometimes inaccurate. But the critical moment in the development of the young shepherd's reputation is his first quarrel. Quarrels are necessarily public. They may occur in the coffee-shop, the village square, or most frequently on a grazing boundary where a curse or stone aimed at one of his straying sheep by another shepherd is an insult which inevitably requires a violent response. In any case some account of the event becomes public property. If the quarrel occurs before unrelated bystanders, the

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

community may obtain a reasonably factual account of the fight. If it is not witnessed by an impartial audience, the contestant with the fewer marks of injury and the greater number of persuasive kinsmen wins the day. It is the critical nature of these first important tests of his manliness that makes the self-regard (ἐγωϊσμός) of the young shepherd so extremely sensitive. It is not only the reality of an obvious insult which provokes him to action, but even the finest of allusions on which it is possible to place some unflattering construction. To direct the slightest public mockery (χορόϊδευμα) against a young shepherd challenges him to fight. It may be possible to recover from an early failure of nerve and conduct, but a series of failures is fatal to a man's reputation. The more clearly his weakness is exposed the more often he risks open ridicule, and only the careful protection of brothers and kinsmen will save him from complete social obloquy. In fact there are few failures. Few physically weak children survive, and from an early age sons learn the meaning of their personal responsibility for the pride and honour of the family.

Sudden death stands close to the Sarakatsani and they are continually aware of its presence. 'He is behind our ear' (τὸν ἔχουμε στὸ ριζάφτι),[3] they say. Many children die in their early years, childbirth is dangerous, shepherds miss their footing on high ridges or fall into swollen rivers. But the tragic quality of the death situation is most evident when the pallikari dies for honour. For the young man will lose the perfection of his manliness if he will not on the instant give up his life in the cause of honour. If men must lead their lives according to a pattern of exemplary actions which express a system of agonistic values, the meaning of existence is the freedom to struggle to realize a certain mode of being and honour which, in the case of the pallikari, the Sarakatsani believe to be as near perfection as the determinations of the human condition will allow. Death extinguishes life, and the ability to compete in terms of pride and significance in social life at the very moment when the pallikari is most fit to compete. Death also removes an individual who was closely bound to family and kin; this is part of the tragedy expressed in the funeral dirge. But if death destroys the individual in the pallikari it leaves untouched his 'persona',

[3] Cf. Chatzimichalis, op. cit., vol. i, Part A, p. ροη'.

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

they are obviously involved in it. But men lie as a matter of habit and principle to deny other people information. And it is one way of expressing their mutual hostility. A head of family who was sincere (ειλικρινής), or without cunning words (ντόμπρος), would be considered foolish and neglectful of his duty.

This is not to say that the Sarakatsani fail to understand the virtues of truth and sincerity; indeed, relations between kinsmen, or between man and God, are based upon them. But between unrelated men the narrow limits of the human condition, particularly envy and poverty, prescribe opposite and meaner values. The essentially 'fallen' character of these relationships is implicit in linguistic usage. Κακός,[4] bad or evil, is sometimes used to indicate a skilful man, especially in operations where cleverness or cunning is required. Πονηρός, which means cunning in the sense of the worker-out of evil, is very frequently used to describe a man like Lambros whose cleverness has to be grudgingly admitted and admired by other men. And, on the other hand, καλός, good, in contexts of character description often refers to a man who is merely weak and irresolute.

But the truly clever man does not give the impression that he is a threat to other men. Except where the interests of his family are critically at stake, he is careful to appear as honourable and well-intentioned towards unrelated men. There are, however, men who practise a small kind of cunning in all their actions. These persons are described as cunning in a sense that is wholly bad. Μάγκας, which means a cunning untrustworthy person, a bearer of mean and untrue scandals, is a word often applied to this kind of man. In the Sarakatsan imagination such a man is small, bent, thin featured, and with narrow close set eyes. The cunning of these men is not the intelligent cleverness of a Lambros, rather it resembles the sexual cunning of women. Both corrupt. The latter corrupts the nobility of men, the former society in general. Cleverness and cunning are legitimate and praiseworthy where their object is the protection or advancement of family interests, but not beyond these limits, or for their own sake.

The heads of families whenever they are free from shepherding

[4] Cf. Hōeg, op. cit., vol. 2, p. 168.

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

156 599 571 517 885 The heads of families whenever they are free from shepherding duties gather in the village square or the coffee-shop. On this public stage the chief representatives of the families of part of the total community appear, and by their attitude and bearing and the recognition and response they accord to one another they confirm or deny the ideal equality of one family with another. This equality is only maintained by a constant effort of self-assertion. A family head must strut about as if his affairs are of the greatest consequence. His expression is expected to be severe and proud. Modesty in these circumstances is no virtue but a sign of weakness. Ideally, the claims and assertions of other men must be at least equalled, and preferably surpassed. Yet care must be taken not to make a boast which can be proved to be empty. The boaster whose bluff has been called [521] is despised. Conversation has a sharp, monosyllabic, contrapuntal quality. It is concerned with self-assertion, not with communication or the exchange of information. On these occasions a man must on no account sit quietly in a corner [525] unspeaking (ἀμίλητος). To withdraw is to admit defeat. Card games often supplement the drinking and the conversation. Although they are games of chance rather than skill, they are acted out with great seriousness. As each man plays his card, this is struck down on to the table with the full force of his open [578] hand. Quarrels are frequent if one man wins too handsomely and makes facetious or boasting remarks to the losers.

Yet a man ought to combine with this competitive behaviour a generally sociable attitude. The essence of being one of a company (παρέα) is equal sharing. Each man in his turn is expected to buy a round of drinks for the others. Any hint of meanness is enough to brand a man as tight-fisted (σφιχτός), a very serious charge. On the other hand, the man who moves to the other extreme, who spends lavishly and indiscriminately on entertaining others, or gambles recklessly at cards, is also condemned. Such people are known as wasteful spenders (σπάταλοι), without any sense of responsibility towards their families.

885 156 599 Caution, moderation, and self-restraint are the qualities demanded of the family head if he is to be a successful steward of his dependants' interests. We have already seen that in questions of honour the head of the family is unable to hazard himself as freely as his unmarried brother. For similar reasons

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

156 in the eyes of others, and how their evaluation of himself relates to the ideal image of how he would wish to appear. Clearly, the more the publicity that surrounds any particular area of social life, the greater is the efficacy of the sentiment of self-regard as a sanction of approved qualities and conduct.

156 577 578 A man's self-regard is typically molested where he is insulted or defamed or believes himself to be so treated. When another person suggests by even indirect allusion that a man is dishonourable or weak he molests his self-regard (προσβάλλει τὸν ἐγωϊσμό του). Or when a man by deed, or word, behaves towards another in such a way as to suggest that he is not worthy of consideration and recognition, he again molests his self-regard; for a man only acts in this way towards another when he considers him to be of lesser reputation and, by inference, less honourable. In such circumstances the core of a man's social personality is touched, his manliness and prepotence are questioned. Then, the only remedy is to attack his detractors with knife or stick.

There are many instances of such a situation. The stoning of a sheep by another shepherd when it has strayed across a boundary. An unguarded public remark which the recipient judges others will consider to be an unanswered insult if he 156 does not retaliate. It is, in part, self-regard which urges the 577 abduction of a girl when a candidate bridegroom has been 583 refused by the girl's father. Christos Kazoukas was refused the hand of the daughter of Paschos. She was too young, the girl's father said, and as she was, indeed, only twenty-two, Christos was prepared to accept this explanation rather than undertake the dangerous business of abduction. But George Carvounis, a second cousin to Christos, heard a different tale that the girl's family had refused Christos because it was said that he was sexually impotent and inadequate. In fact, the girl's mother had dubbed him by a nickname, 'Lame penis' (κουτσοπούτσα), which referred literally to these supposed short-comings. Christos had a smooth skin, fine features and a strikingly high-pitched voice. Simply, he did not look the part 624 of a pallikari. There was, therefore, all the greater urgency 612 that he should reply to these damning allegations; for the alternative was ridicule and shame. His kinsmen offered united moral support and the unspoken threat of abandonment if he did nothing.

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

opposition of the sexes. It is consistent with the radical character of this opposition that most virtues are sex-linked. Since the sensuality of sex is a critical flaw in human nature, chastity becomes an important element in honour, around which those complementary virtues, the self-assertive qualities of the men, the modest constricted virtues of the women, are organized in defence. At the same time the moral superiority of the male sex in this opposition allows the main burden of the responsibility for original sin to be borne by the woman in a way that does not compromise the inherent nobility of man which is, necessarily, a premise of a system of values based on ideas of honour. And the complementary opposition of the two sexes and their ideal attributes allows the introduction of those quieter feminine virtues of love, modesty, and a disposition to co-operate, without inconsistency in relation to the self-assertive male values, and in the context of inner family life where they are most necessary to express the moral solidarity of the family and support those who face a hostile and competitive world.

The second relevant feature of social structure is the solidarity of the family, and the categorical nature of obligations between its members. This solidarity is both active and passive. Whatever is done or suffered by one member equally affects the honour and shame of the others. No actor stands in isolation without reference to his membership in a family. He carries always a weight of representative responsibility when his actions are observed or even speculated on by others. And, on the other hand, the family is a small group in which there is no security of anonymity when other members fail. In these circumstances, where there is individual responsibility but no certainty of individual justice, important values are variations on the theme of strength and weakness, success and failure. Without self-confidence, prepotence, and skill, a man is 'lost' (χαμένος), morally as well as practically.

The relationships of hostility between families unconnected by ties of kinship or marriage are the third feature of social structure. They are oppositions consistent with a particular form of bilateral kinship system, and the absence of any forms of political or economic co-operation other than those based on relationship or patronage. These potentially destructive

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

confrontations are reconciled through the acceptance of competition for prestige as the end of individual and family purpose. For it turns men's minds from thoughts of the physical destruction of their enemies to the alternative of their social humiliation, a form of opposition more compatible with the vulnerable quality of the shepherd's life. At the same time these particular values, if they deny the practicability of universal moral principles and individual justice, present an image of man that is in some ways heroic and not ignoble. Men must be brave and women virtuous to achieve ideal, one might say mythical, forms of acting and being. They are encouraged in the need to discipline their weaknesses by the severity of their mutual criticism; roles are few, and values unambiguous in a common field of experience. But judgements concern the effectiveness of the total social personality, an amalgam of virtues, skills, and material attributes; and not abstract qualities of moral excellence.

In competitive institutions, although feelings of hostility may remain unabated, opposition becomes a form of mutual dependence; the more men are opposed in this way, the more they have need of one another. The values of prestige recommend the intense consideration of own interests and honour, accentuating always the exclusiveness and separation of one family from another. Yet they also impose the condition that prestige depends on the attentions and opinions of others. They separate; and, at the same time, they create a necessary and close interdependence in the common membership of a community in honour.

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

182 577 771 156 leader and accept the need for lies and deceit, the ideal social personality remains the unmarried pallikari, the 'innocent' (ἀθῶος), alone with his sheep, not yet fully implicated in the ancestral sins of sensuality and envy.

182 578 776 771 These beliefs indicate, clearly enough, that the Sarakatsani sense that all is not right with their world, a sentiment that is Christian not heroic. When men quarrel and draw their knives, an event that is the breath of life in an heroic culture, the Sarakatsani say, 'The Devil is dancing in the middle' (χορεύει ὁ διάβολος μέσα). Indeed the Devil is the symbol and the efficient cause of all those many tensions and hostilities which prevent the Sarakatsani from living in the values of Christian fellowship. Not only is he the original cause of the miasma of ancestral sin, the provoker of the evil eye and the tempter to sexual lusts, but in his desire to injure physically where he cannot corrupt morally, his action on the spiritual plane parallels the mutual hostilities and social isolation which each family experiences in social life.

182 577 771 829 When all this is said there remains an opposition between Christian ideals and the values of prestige. Fortunately or otherwise, the Sarakatsani do not see this; partly because the two value systems either appear to be complementary as in family or kindred, or in other areas of social life they are relatively segregated in their incidence; and partly because the individual thinking in egocentric terms cannot see that his own honour, prestige, pride, and self-regard threaten another. It is always the other man, and, behind, the Devil moving and manipulating him, who corrupt society and provoke the anger of God.

/134 cont./

586 587 182 [581] solidarity among the different Sarakatsani groups, it is obvious that divorce or a second marriage would irremediably disturb the established alliances. Even more. There would be a risk that they might give rise to hostilities and disorder.

586 182 578 602 As a matter of fact, in the first case, the dismissal of the wife, an opposite act to that of marriage, implies by its very nature the estrangement /135/ from kin-by-marriage. From another standpoint, it can scarcely fail to provoke feelings of humiliation, of wounded self-esteem, of disappointed egoism, all the more conducive to the development of tensions, if not conflicts, when all of this takes place on a collective level.

[587] Moreover, in case of the death of the wife, the new marriage would separate from the husband's life the relatives of the deceased, who would be replaced in the alliance by the relative of the new wife--an event which could potentially create an explosive situation between two lineages.

586 581 602 858 578 [613] The existence of children would aggravate and multiply the respective grievances. Obligatorily bound at one and the same time to the relatives of their mother and to the relatives of the new wife of their father, the children would be compelled to live in an ambiguous situation. If disaffections of this kind should appear, the matter would concern not only the two lineages involved, but also all the lineages related to the principals by marriage. One sees the entanglement and the number of antagonisms would thus become considerable.

581 182 Therefore, there is no doubt that, in the face of the possibility of such serious social complications, the interest of the group require that, if the traditional system cannot be made more flexible, the individuals and their personal happiness must be sacrificed for its benefit.

[593] [586] [587] This is exactly what happens among the Sarakatsani. Even if life together turns out to be unbearable, the couple must go on. And the widower or the widow remain solitary until death.

* * * *

/141 cont./

848 We believe that the true justification for this suppression
842 resides in the necessity of controlling conception and hence the
(833) legitimacy of a birth. It is for this reason that the sexual act
(602) must be performed in the midst of the family.

852 Thirdly and finally, three days after the birth, the father receives
574 his friends and his relatives to celebrate the first bath of the new-
[431] born child. While everyone brings small gift, he for his part must "sacrifice" a lamb and prepare it on the spit for his visitors.

851 This small celebration has for its object chiefly the presentation
852 of the newborn child to the society to which its father belongs and
848 which in turn adopts it. At the same time it constitutes for the father
182 the occasion to announce, albeit implicitly and indirectly, the legitimacy of his child. If he did not consider it his own, why would he celebrate its birth?

848 /142/ In all that has gone before there is nothing that ought to
848 surprise us: When we know that the foundation of Sarakatsani society
602 rests on the family as such, and that this family in turn is founded on blood kinship, on kinship on the father's side above all, we can easily understand that the legitimacy of descent merits altogether special attention.

If the offspring is not legitimate there is no reason why he should be integrated into the society. There is no reason why he should enjoy all the privileges that kinship brings him--assistance on the part of other members, economic cooperation, solidarity, security.

(613) Conversely, it is impossible for him to obtain for others what a true kinsman is able to give them, that is to say, an alliance with his lineage, since he does not have one.

848 Consequently, any dispute about legitimacy must be excluded in
578 advance. That is because it could bring about an unsettling of kinship
602 bonds and provoke a veritable dislocation of the system of social relationships as we have described them in the preceding pages. In other words,

848 /142 cont./
578 a dispute of this kind could only engender disorder, even the dis-
602 solution of the group.

848 It is, moreover, within this same complex of ideas that we must
684 seek the justification of the sanction which is imposed on any woman convicted of adultery and which always means death. It is essential, first of all, to prevent even the possibility of illegitimate children. Sarakatsani law that threatens with capital punishment the women who betray conjugal fidelity, does not seek to punish the flouting of love, since love does not exist between spouses--at least officially. It merely preserves the integrity of Sarakatsani society.

The Life Style of the Conjugal Family.

855 The presence of children in the family raises a whole series
594 of questions dealing with their education, their status and their relations with each other as well as with their parents.

855 Up to the age of approximately ten years the children of both
593 sexes grow up together under the vigilance of their mother. That is
594 the period of their lives when, on the one hand, the father is seldom involved and, on the other hand, bonds are established between them and with their mother. /143/ Having reached this age, the boys begin to follow their father and their older brothers in order to learn the methods of herding, while the girls remain close to their mother in order to be initiated into the mysteries of the distaff and the loom.

593 Toward their father all the children without distinction owe
594 absolute obedience and devotion. The study of marriage has sufficiently shown this.

Toward their mother the girls likewise owe obedience and devotion.

For the sons the situation is different. We were present at the return to the parental hut after a long absence of a Sarakatsani son aged 30 years. We remember vividly the scene of his meeting with his mother, which made a great impression on us. He bowed to her and kissed her hand.

/167 cont./

mention--except for the choice of husband for one of the offspring and the right of economic control--all the acts relevant to the "family spirit" that are inherent in it, personal relations between parents and children, brothers and sisters, etc.

/168/ All these examples emanate from actual family life, but by comparison with the sphere controlled by the framework embracing the extended family, one sees that this is very little.

When one of its elements, a single family or individual, tries to act independently in one of the sectors other than those we have enumerated, they find themselves faced with a conflict between individuals, between groups, or between an individual and a group, a conflict which sooner or later ends in a split.

However, this is not the moment to speak of that; nor is this the moment to examine how the extended family ordinarily protects itself against this type of crisis, thanks among other factors to the dynamism of the phenomena of obligation-compensation which develops in its midst and also thanks to the mechanism of social control which is peculiar to it. We shall content ourselves for now in describing only these two means of defence (the second in a special section), thus preparing the ground for our final chapter.

* * * *

In point of fact, the conjugal families transfer their rights to the extended family. The effectiveness of the system, shown throughout the preceding analyses, constitutes their compensation. The head-manager, to whom his subjects have transferred their rights, enjoys the dignity and privileges of headman and the unquestionable recognition of his talents.

Although they have transferred their economic responsibilities to the head-manager, the heads of conjugal families are, in return, relieved of much worry; they represent productive forces in the family economy and possess the right to censure the headman; masters in their own

/180 cont./

474 554 598 Dissatisfactions and disagreements sometimes arise between the Tséligas and the participants. Likewise, his management may provoke controversies.

(629) To cope with these difficulties, arbitration is provided; each party proposes one or two other Tséligas as arbiters, and the sentence pronouced is obligatory for everyone. The chapter devoted to Sarakatsani law will give us all the details of this.

474 596 571 On the other hand, the daily life of the families belonging to the Tséligato changes in no way except for the fact that they have ceased to be isolated. Their interior functioning continues to remain the same. It is only /181/ that thereafter their members have the opportunity to develop social relations (friendships, congenialities, as well as hatreds and dislikes) with a greater number of individuals. Thus, social life becomes more intense.

474 596 554 For the headmen of families, responsibilities weigh less heavily. The Tséligas is always there to assume them in the name of all. Since they represent the link between their family group and the head, they receive instructions and benefits from him and, twice a year, before the change of location, "accounts are settled with him." Then, should the occasion arise, the Tséligas must "give an account of his management of the family enterprise associated with the Tséligato" to the members of the family, of which they are in charge.

474 883 (621) The communal defence against wolves, bandits and trespassing devolves upon all the young men of the Tséligato, who must act collectively, aided if necessary by all the able-bodied men. The Tséligato is a community which its members must all defend together, whether the individual or possessions are threatened.

596 629 A vendetta, on the other hand, remains a family affair. The other participants do not involve themselves in it.

/208 cont./

474 675 671 initiative, which nonetheless develops in the context of Sarakatsani society and its cultural system.

The agents of ajudication, of sanction and coercion.

578 691 The elements of the problem: daily life and therefore all the questions relating to marriage, kinship and the functioning of the family, as well as the removal of the head, the checking of accounts of the family management and of the Tséligato, claims and quarrels between members and the Tséligas, the settling of various questions pertaining to guardianship, the division of an inheritance and so forth, create and represent numerous cases in which conflicts and litigations may arise.

578 627 692 691 Now all these questions must be solved one way or another. Though the agents of ajudication are multiple they are not always obvious. The same is true for the agents of sanction and coercion who are very often identical with the former.

In our effort to determine them we note first of all that the only official, hence visible tribunal that the Sarakatsani are acquainted with is that of arbiters.

[648] [199] Of course, an appeal to the official law of the surrounding society is always possible, but the Sarakatsani do not have recourse to it. (20)

20. This appeal would constitute a violation of the principle of isolation from the surrounding society, of which the Sarakatsani are very jealous.

691 692 629 [602] If the litigation concerns family questions and disagreements between members of the same family, the arbiters are recruited by the parties concerned from among the oldest relatives (uncles, for example).

[474] If the dispute is between strangers (members of the Tséligato and the head, for example), each of the parties proposes as arbiter one or two Tséligas.

The sentence, always binding and without appeal, from the viewpoint is formulated and pronounced according to what is good and fair to

/212 cont./
process of obeying, other factors intervene, and that we must discover them in analyzing this phenomenon in its totality, true to the heritage of M. Mauss. (27)

27. See M. Mauss: Essai sur le don, p. 275-276.-- It is noteworthy that Malinowski, ibid., pp. 39, 41,42, in in his effort to explain the obediance of the Trobrianders to their legal customs, gives an interpretation identical to ours concerning obedience to arbiters, based on his famous "principle of reciprocity." We have explained above that this principle does not cover all of the life of law. And we shall give a more detailed critique of Malinowski's theory in one of the following sections. If we find his positions deficient it is because they are formulated according to his functionalist method which seems to us inadequate, in keeping with C. Lévi-Strauss: Introduction, p. xxxvi, who says: "Where Mauss saw a constant relationship between the phenomena as their explanation, Malinowski asks himself what they are for in order to seek a justification for them."

Every altercation between individuals is translated in actual fact into an opposition between groups. The members of the family of each interested party, bound to him by solidarity and alliance, will follow him all the more readily when disputes submitted to arbiters are of an economic order, hence handled by the head. If portions of families are set against each other in the core of the extended family or the Tséligato these groups run the danger of splitting. The principle of cooperation and solidarity is then challenged. And where, until then, peace reigned, there is threat of disorder and insecurity. Besides, the principle of the isolation of Sarakatsani from surrounding society is also endangered. For if the recalcitrant refuses to obey the arbiters, the only recourse to justice is the State, which means interference of non-Sarakatsani (formerly the occupying forces) in Sarakatsani affairs. Finally, the

/397 cont./

578 It is possible that conjugal families or small lineages will one day find themselves in competition or in conflict with each other or with the extended family of which they are a part or with both at the same time.

The many causes of competition may be classified into two categories:

Occasional causes reflecting conflicts /398/ arising from a specific combination of circumstances, as for example, personal discord between heads or other members of the sub-groups of the family unit (dislikes, jealousies, disputes, rancor, hatred, etc.), disagreements about the managament or because of the managament of the common enterprise, ambitions of a sub-group's head who aspires to become an independent head, etc.

578 627 182 The means at the disposal of Sarakatsani society to cope with this are both manifold and effective: in case of discord or personal ambitions, the individuals concerned may demand their "share" of the common goods and leave, or else join another Tséligato. Likewise, economic disagreements may be solved either by arbitration or by the dismissal of an incapable head-manager, or finally by splitting up and dispersing. At worst, the original family group may find itself lessened in strength or even split up. But in general the means of bypassing differences, true safety values, channel the pressures in directions provided for, and avoid a challenge to the adopted way of life, as would be the case if the explosive situations did not have another outlet.

578 Causes inherent in the very system of Sarakatsani life, reflecting social conflicts that derive from its inherent characteristics. It is chiefly this second category of rivalries which, as constant dangers to the equilibrium, merit our attention.

[121] As a matter of fact, according to a correct but very much disputed formula by C. Lévi-Strauss, "no society is perfect. Each one has by

/398 cont./

578 121 nature an impurity that is incompatible with the norms it proclaims and that expresses itself concretely in a certain amount of injustice, insensitivity, cruelty..." (1)

1. C. Lévi-Strauss: Tristes Tropiques /Sad Tropics/, p. 417.

578 571 This assertion, equally valid for Sarakatsani society, opens the way to the study of its imperfections, that is, the asymmetries of social relations which are peculiar to it and which arise from the total social phenomenon and from its structure. These asymmetries ceaselessly threaten the structure.

Now, in studying the internal hierarchy of the family group we see that the subjugation of small lineages and conjugal families to the extended family, of junior age groups /399/ to the senior ones, women to men, families of participants in the Tséligato and the participants themselves to the Tséligas and to his family carries with it the potential germs of revolt. If the revolt becomes reality it will completely change the life of our herders.

578 However, such a development seems excluded and this thanks to the dynamics of many factors.

578 182 155 626 183 The first of these factors is indisputably the socially guided preparation of the Sarakatsani as individuals to accept in advance the norms governing the subjugation and the hierarchization, with everything oppressive and unjust that they include. The preparation in question presupposes a molding of character and the implanting in the collective, as well as the individual, mentality of a certain number of ideas, notions, and principles in terms of which individuals and groups are made to see their lives, or, not to be able to imagine a different life - which amounts to the same thing.

183 /399 cont./

578 In the second place, there is constraint in the general sense of
182 the term. It appears first in the influence of the Tséligas, the head,
626 who, to the extent that he has a strong personality and a true capacity
[474] to govern, is in a position to impose on his subjects the traditional
[554] norms by which the family group functions and thus to safeguard its
cohesion and its content /sic: "son conteny"/. Constraint manifests
[671] itself next in law and morality, the two aspects of group constraint
[577] which, armed with social support, act sovereignly in favor of the socio-
cultural status quo. The analysis of the way they are enforced has
demonstrated their effectiveness.

578 In the third place are the idealization and mythization of the
182 "Sarakatsani condition," the elevation to the rank of supreme value and
183 myth every cultural solution to each specific problem. No matter that
the application of these solutions, coldly considered, entails priva-
tions, concessions, and demands abnegation or sacrifice! In psychoanalytic
terms, one might call this phenomenon sublimation.

578 Religion for its part, with its teaching and traditions that
771 prescribe obedience to headmen, to elders, and justify the subordination
183 of the woman, while sanctioning the traditions by salvation, also supports
182 the social edifice by determining behavior and its motivation, that is
to say, by determining collective attitudes.

578 Finally, we encounter the mechanism of "obligation-compensation"
695 /400/ of which we have spoken above, (2)
182

2. See above, p. 205-206, etc.

and to which we should like to add some details--first of all terminolog-
[121] ically. The notion of alienation is taken here in its primitive and
legal meaning (Lalande) according to which alienatus is not free. Thus,
it is not identical with mental alienation or with alienation according

/400 cont./

578 675 182 121 to the Marxist theory, (3)

3. On the different meanings of the term alienation in Marx see: G. Gurvitch: La vocation, vol, II, pp. 253-258. although these have their origin in it. We use this term to indicate every case in which groups and individuals yield to other groups or other individuals all or part of their social or economic independence, their initiative, their activity, consciously or unconsciously, in the hope of obtaining in return a profit, a privilege, the recognition of certain rights, or more generally, some sort of satisfaction. [Eds. 128 note: since this meaning of the word "alienation" would not be immediately apparent to readers of parts of the text in English in the Files, the term has been translated where used as "obligation"]. 578 675 182 121 The term "compensation" designates exactly this counter-benefit and distinguishes it clearly from purely psychological compensation or psychoanalytic sublimation. Let us add further that compensation may be real, ideological or presumed, present or anticipated. It is not necessary that there be an absolute equivalence between the two terms. A relative equivalence suffices for this mechanism to bear fruit. Observation of societies shows that individuals and groups are mutually bound by manifold contributions of the obligation-compensation type which, in the final analysis, makes possible, up to a certain point, life in society. Of course, the nature, content, number, etc., of relations of this kind varies with the types of partial or whole societies and their structures. And if one wishes to analyze them, one will find that they reflect society as a whole, while being linked specifically with models, statuses, social roles, collective attitudes, ideas, values and mentalities. However, it would be erronous to believe that the relationship "obligation-compensation" is a contractual relationship. It could be, but is not always, or rather is so

578 /400 cont./
675 only in limited cases. Finally, it is certain that all relationships
182 of domination would degenerate into simple pressure relations (4)
121

4. On this distinction see G. Gurvitch: La Vocation, Vol. I, p. 222.

which in their turn would become situations of conflict if the mechanism "obligation-compensation" would not intervene to /401/ ensure at least a precarious equilibrium, provided that the total social phenomenon and social structure favor it.

578 In the case of the Sarakatsani, the mechanism in question enables
675 individuals and groups not to consider their subordination as slavery
182 pure and simple. For the principles of organization of their social life
183 are oriented toward a strong integration of all elements, individuals or
121 groups in a system where the maximum of socio-economic security is accorded to all. A sort of blueprint or secular and "primitive" control which determines each person's place in advance, permits him to benefit from a maximum of foresight. The main ideas that dominates Sarakatsani social organization and emanates from the value, of community is to ensure the destiny of each of its members. This represents the chief compensation of any subjugation, and we can now evaluate it according to its true nature. Moreover, the prerogatives of each person (man, woman, headman, participants), be they administrative, family, religious or magical prerogatives, neutralize the possible feelings of frustration which otherwise could make their appearance and be extremely virulent and disintegrating.

In short, the role of the "obligation-compensation" mechanism on behalf of equilibrium and a lack of schism proves fundamental. This is so obvious that it seems to us unnecessary to emphasize it. This mechanism provides not only the justification for the asymmetries in Sarakatsani

/401 cont./

508 275 182 183 121 society the "injustices and incompatibilities between norms and their realization." according to the formula of Lévi-Strauss, but also the means of overcoming them, and that in a constructive way.

As for the threats against the equilibrium arising from social units other than the family, we should like to emphasize that they are minor. The hostility of Sarakatsani society toward non-conformists [626] exerts sufficient constraint to intimidate those who might possible violate the adopted socio-cultural models, this constraint consolidates [177] both these models and the social equilibrium. Furthermore, since surrounding society is indifferent to the Sarakatsani who themselves insist on preserving their isolation, and does not interfere with their lives, it does not upset the equilibrium nor endanger its continuance. Or rather, that is what went on up to the last decades / "decennies?"/

* * * *

121 178 182 /402/ Nevertheless, other threats arise from one-dimensional elements of Sarakatsani society, and present the possibility of changing the latter.

In fact, if the technology or crafts, the organization of the family and the Tséligato, the economic system, law and morality, knowledge, magic or religion changed, they would bring about changes capable of loosening the general structure from top to bottom, given the close dialectical bonds existing between them.

However, this possibility is slight, for several reasons. First of all, because the change of one of these elements would encounter the resistance of all the others, precisely because of the dialectical link. In the second place, because all these elements are cultural solutions to concrete problems and their effectiveness has been demonstrated by experience. No one would agree to modify them in favor of a non-proven